

JOURNAL

OF UKRAINIAN STUDIES

Roman Serbyn: *Podolynsky's Defense of an Independent Ukrainian Movement*

Translation: *The Podolynsky-Smirnov Correspondence*

Пантелеймон Куліш: *Зазивний лист до української інтелігенції*

Myroslav Shkandrij: *The Worker in Early Soviet Ukrainian Prose*

Vivian Olender: *The Canadian Methodist Church and Assimilation*

Мирослав Прокоп і Іван Лисяк-Рудницький: *Дискусія про ОУН*

Reviews

13
FALL 1982

ЖУРНАЛ
УКРАЇНОЗНАВЧИХ СТУДІЙ

EDITOR

George S. N. Luckyj

MANAGING EDITOR

Roman Senkus

EDITORIAL BOARD: J. Marko Bojcun, *York University* • Yury Boshyk, *University of Toronto* • Oleh Ilnytzkyj, *University of Manitoba* • Bohdan Krawchenko, *University of Alberta* • George Liber, *Columbia University* • Andrij Makuch, *University of Alberta* • Bohdan Mytrowytch, *Université de Paris* • Peter J. Potichnyj, *McMaster University* • Ivan L. Rudnytsky, *University of Alberta* • Orest H. T. Rudzik, *University of Toronto* • Roman Serbyn, *Université du Québec à Montréal* • Myroslav Shkandrij, *University of Calgary* • Danylo H. Struk, *University of Toronto*.

The *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* is published semiannually, in the spring and fall, by the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies. Annual subscription rates are \$8.00 for individuals and \$12.00 for libraries and institutions. Cheques and money orders are payable in Canadian or American funds only to Journal of Ukrainian Studies. Please do not send cash. Subscribers outside Canada: please pay in U.S. funds.

The *Journal* publishes articles on Ukrainian-related subjects in the humanities and social sciences. The criterion for acceptance of submissions is their scholarly contribution to the field of Ukrainian studies. The *Journal* also publishes translations, documents, information, book reviews, letters and journalistic articles of a problem-oriented, controversial nature. Those wishing to submit manuscripts should observe the guidelines on the inside back cover.

Manuscripts, books for review, and all correspondence regarding subscriptions, changes of address, and editorial matters should be sent to: *Journal of Ukrainian Studies, Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada, M5S 1A1*.

© 1982 by the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies.

Typesetting by Harmony Printing Limited, Toronto, Canada.

Printed by the University of Toronto Press.

ISSN 0228-1635

Articles

- Roman Serbyn*, In Defense of an Independent Ukrainian Socialist Movement: Three Letters from Serhii Podolynsky to Valerian Smirnov 3
- Пантелеймон Куліш*, Зазивний лист до української інтелігенції 33
- Myroslav Shkandrij*, Fiction by Formula: The Worker in Early Soviet Ukrainian Prose 47
- Vivian Olender*, The Canadian Methodist Church and the Gospel of Assimilation, 1900–1925 61
- Мирослав Прокоп і Іван Лисяк-Рудницький*, Дискусія про ОУН 75

Reviews

- George Gajecky, *The Cossack Administration of the Hetmanate* (Alexander Baran) 87
- Orest Subtelny, *The Mazepists* (Theodore Mackiw) 88
- Fan Parker and Stephen Jan Parker, *Russia on Canvas: Ilya Repin* (Myroslava M. Mudrak) 91
- Fylymon Tarnavsky, *Spohady* (John-Paul Himka) 94
- Richard Pipes, *Struve: Liberal on the Right* (Konstantin Huytan) 97
- Hryhorii Kostyuk, *Volodymyr Vynnychenko ta ioho doba* (Melanie Pytlowany-Kordiuk) 99
- George G. Grabowicz, *The Poet as Mythmaker: A Study of Symbolic Meaning in Taras Ševčenko* (George S. N. Luckyj) 100
- Myroslav Prokop, *Ukraina i ukrainska polityka Moskvu* (James E. Mace) 102
- Ostap Vyshnia, *Hard Times* (Maxim Tarnawsky) 103
- Slovnyk ukrajins'koji movy* (George A. Perfecky) 106
- Slovnyk staroukrajins'koji movy XIV-XV st.* (George A. Perfecky) 110
- Борис Антоненко-Давидович, *Як ми говоримо* (Микола Павлюк) 113
- William Darcovich and Paul Yuzyk, eds., *A Statistical Compendium on the Ukrainians in Canada* (Nadia Skop) 117
- Aleksander Sokolyszyn and Vladimir Wertsman, eds., *Ukrainians in Canada and the United States* (Frances Swyripa) 120
- Bohdan P. Procko, *Ukrainian Catholics in America* (Russel P. Moroziuk) 122
- Books Received 124

Contributors

VIVIAN OLENDER is a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Theology, St. Michael's College, University of Toronto, specializing in Ukrainian-Canadian church history.

MYROSLAV PROKOP is a publicist and former director of the Prolog Research Corporation in New York City.

IVAN LYSIAK-RUDNYTSKY is a professor of East European and Ukrainian history at the University of Alberta in Edmonton.

ROMAN SERBYN is a professor of Russian and East European history at the Université du Québec à Montréal. He is writing a book on Serhii Podolynsky.

MYROSLAV SHKANDRIJ is an assistant professor in the Department of Germanic and Slavic Studies at the University of Calgary, where he teaches courses in Ukrainian language and culture.

Roman Serbyn

IN DEFENSE OF AN INDEPENDENT UKRAINIAN SOCIALIST MOVEMENT: THREE LETTERS FROM SERHII PODOLYNSKY TO VALERIAN SMIRNOV

Nascent Ukrainian socialism found itself in a quandary: should Ukrainian socialists form their own organizations, or should they join the existing Russian and Polish movements; would Russians and Poles accept an independent Ukrainian movement as a legitimate, separate member of international socialism? The answers to these questions would depend ultimately on whether the Ukrainian socialists felt strongly enough about their Ukrainianism to maintain their own identity, whether they considered that the Ukrainian nation had needs and interests distinct from those of its neighbors, and if they did, whether they could prevail upon their Russian and Polish partners to concur.

In the nineteenth century, Russian revolutionaries, radical thinkers, and even liberals readily acknowledged the existence of a distinct Polish nation and accepted separate Polish political movements. They found it very difficult, however, to extend the same recognition to the Ukrainians. To most Russians, Ukrainians remained "Little Russians" who, together with themselves, the "Great Russians," formed a single "pan-Russian" (*obshcherusskaia*) or simply "Russian" nation. It is true that Herzen and Bakunin proclaimed Ukraine's right to a separate national existence, but they were exceptions among the influential Russian thinkers. The Poles were generally not better disposed to the idea of a separate Ukrainian identity. Polish patriots regarded Right-Bank Ukraine and eastern (Ukrainian) Galicia as an integral part of Poland, indispensable to the future sovereign Polish state. Only in moments of heightened political activity, for example, when the Ukrainian movement gained momentum in the early 1860s and became a tempting potential ally, were the Russian revolutionaries and the Polish insurgents willing to make some grudging concessions to Ukrainian claims.

In the mid-1870s, three political thinkers dominated the Russian revolutionary scene: the propagandist Petr Lavrov, the agitator Mikhail Bakunin, and the blanquist Petr Tkachev. Only Tkachev openly denied the existence of a Ukrainian nationality and advocated organizational centralism for both the Russian revolutionary movement and the future Russian socialist state. Lavrov and Bakunin were avowed federalists, but centralist tendencies were growing among their own supporters. The Ukrainophile socialists rejected this trend and condemned the disregard for the Ukrainian problem of the Russian revolutionaries.

On the issue of their participation in revolutionary movements, the Ukrainian socialists were of two minds. Many were attracted to the Russian movements and accepted their centralist principles. Others condemned the Russian radicals' disregard for the Ukrainian problem, and advocated the formation of an independent Ukrainian movement. They sought their inspiration and their roots in the Ukrainian populism of the peasant lovers (*khlopomany*) of the 1860s and, like them, came to be labelled as Ukrainophiles.

The three letters by Serhii Podolynsky to his friend Valerian Smirnov in May 1875, as well as the draft of a questionnaire prepared by the latter, reflect the divergent approaches to populist activism characteristic of the two political milieus. Smirnov was a Russian revolutionary who after a short flirt with anarchism joined Lavrov and helped him edit the journal *Forward!* (*Vpered!*) Smirnov and Podolynsky's personal friendship, often put to the test, survived till the end, and Podolynsky continued to help Smirnov financially. But the two fell out politically. Smirnov remained a Russian centralist, while Podolynsky became convinced of the necessity of a separate Ukrainian movement.

Podolynsky's letters provide one of the earliest systematic defenses of an independent Ukrainian socialist movement. They correct the claim of Soviet historians that the Ukrainian socialists defended the principle of a single, centralized socialist organization for all the nations of the Russian Empire and that separate national organizations were demanded only by the so-called bourgeois nationalists. They also add a dimension to Western historiography, which tends to ignore the non-Russian socialist movements in the empire. Podolynsky's views were shared by other Ukrainian socialists, and their theoretical positions and tactics must be investigated in order to obtain a rounded picture of both the socialist movement in Eastern Europe in the nineteenth century and the Ukrainian national revival.

*

Serhii Andriiovych Podolynsky (1850-91) was the only surviving child of a rich aristocratic family. Little is known about his early life. He spent his childhood on the family estate in Iaroslavka, a village in the southern part of Kiev gubernia. Like other Ukrainophiles before him, Podolynsky probably played with the Ukrainian peasant children from the village, learned their language and songs, and was touched by the peasants' plight. At home he most likely received a patriotic Russian upbringing, since his mother was Princess Kudasheva, and his father a poet of the Pushkin pleiad. The elder Podolynsky, even though he was of Ukrainian descent, was thoroughly Russified and showed little sympathy for the Ukrainian revival; in 1862 he even penned a ditty to discredit Ukrainophile students.

Serhii obtained his secondary education in the Kiev First Gymnasium. In 1867 he enrolled in the Department of Natural Science at the University of Kiev. Andrii Podolynsky did not believe in hampering his son's intellectual growth and did not censure his reading or check his acquaintances. Serhii could thus become familiar with the latest Western and Russian theories and come in contact with the socialist and Ukrainophile ideas espoused by the Ukrainian intellectuals in the semisecret organization known as Hromada. He frequented meetings of various student circles and in one of them heard Mykola Ziber, a rising young Marxist economist, lecture on Marxian economic thought. In 1871 Podolynsky was sent as a delegate by a clandestine Kiev student group to an organizational meeting in Moscow convened by a populist group known as the Chaikovtsy, which specialized in mass propaganda. That year Podolynsky graduated with a candidate's degree and went abroad to study medicine.

The next ten years of Podolynsky's life, spent mostly in Western and Central Europe, were filled with frantic activity and impressive achievements. He studied in Paris and Zurich and received his medical degree from the University of Breslau in 1876. While still a student, Podolynsky used his longer sojourns in Iaroslavka and Kiev to dispense medical help to peasants and workers. He had become a doctor for humanitarian and tactical reasons: medicine relieved human suffering and was a convenient cover for popular education and agitation. Doctor Podolynsky set up evening classes, where he promoted socialist ideas while teaching the three Rs. But he also collected health data and used it later in his publications. Settling down in Montpellier, France, at the beginning of 1878, Podolynsky continued to practice medicine and lectured at the local medical school.

From the spring of 1872, when he met Lavrov in Paris, until 1875, Podolynsky collaborated very closely with the Russian revolutionaries of the Lavrovist faction. Through Lavrov he met Marx and Engels in London in 1872. That same year, as a Lavrovist, he attended the Hague Congress of the First International, where he sided with the federalists against the centralists. While in Zurich, he was one of the leaders of the Lavrovist students in their struggle with the Bakuninists for the control of the local Russian student colony. Podolynsky was the prime mover behind the setting up of Lavrov's journal, *Forward!* He started the search for a suitable printing press, recruited writers, collected funds, set up a route for smuggling the contraband journal into Ukraine, and contributed his own money and articles.

By 1874 Podolynsky had become disenchanted with the Lavrovists and the Russian revolutionaries in general. As a Ukrainophile with Pan-Slavic federalist leanings, he had as his aim a united socialist movement of all the Slavic peoples, and he wanted to see as its organ a popular journal accessible to the common people of the entire Slavic world. Yet the Russian revolutionaries, he discovered, were indifferent to the national question and often openly hostile to Ukrainian aspirations, while *Forward!* remained a "thick" journal for the Russian intelligentsia. This alienated Podolynsky from the Russian movement and drew him closer to the Ukrainian camp.

Podolynsky's commitment to Ukrainophile principles appeared early: at the beginning of 1873 he organized an evening commemorating Taras Shevchenko and even solicited an oration for the occasion from Mykhailo Drahomanov. In 1875 three brochures appeared in Vienna. Two of them, *The Steam Engine* (*Parova mashyna*) and *On Poverty* (*Pro bidnist*), were original works by Podolynsky; the third, *Truth* (*Pravda*), was Podolynsky's adapted translation of the Russian brochure *The Cunning Trick* (*Khitraia mekhanika*) by Vasilii Varzar, a friend from Podolynsky's university days. These brochures were the first socialist publications in the Ukrainian language. *The Steam Engine* was an idyllic description of the life of Ukrainian workers after the socialist revolution; *On Poverty* was an illustration of Marx's theory of surplus value; and *Truth* exposed the injustice of the taxation system.

The politically motivated emigration in 1876 of Drahomanov, and later of Mykhailo Pavlyk, Fedir Vovk, and others, strengthened Podolynsky's determination to work for a Ukrainian socialist movement and facilitated the realization of such old dreams as the publication of a Ukrainian socialist periodical. Podolynsky

helped Drahomanov to set up and then edit the journal *Community (Hromada)* and contributed money and articles to it.

Podolynsky was an original and prolific writer. In his ten active years he contributed over twenty articles to more than a dozen journals and wrote several brochures and four long studies. It is possible that there are more writings by Podolynsky that have not yet been identified. His works appeared in Ukrainian, Russian, Belorussian, Polish, French, German, Italian, and possibly in other languages. Only the works published after Podolynsky's permanent emigration in 1877 bear his name; earlier Podolynsky intended to settle eventually in Ukraine and therefore kept his connection with subversive literature hidden from the Russian authorities. Podolynsky's writings cover a wide variety of subjects: popular propaganda, the history of the First International, Ukrainian and Russian socialism, the exploitation of peasants in Ukraine, social unrest, travel notes from Galicia and Spain, Ukrainian social and economic history, popular hygiene, and solar energy. His theory of solar energy as the source of surplus value attracted the attention of Marx and Engels and, more recently, the Ukrainian dissident writer Mykola Rudenko.*

As a political thinker Podolynsky combined Marxist economics, a Ukrainian orientation on the peasantry, and Russian revolutionary populism and adapted them to the Ukrainian setting of his day. Traditional exploitation of the Ukrainian toiling masses, aggravated by advancing capitalism, would be ended by a violent revolution in which the Ukrainian peasantry, with its Cossack traditions, would play a major role. Like the Russian populists, Podolynsky believed that the peasant communes (*obshchiny*), even in their weak Ukrainian version (*hromady*), and the workers' artels predisposed the common people to socialism. The future socialist society would consist of free associations of peasants and workers that would join to form a pyramid of interlocking federations. This system would allow all Ukrainian lands to be united and would assure the harmonious economic and cultural growth of the Ukrainian nation. Podolynsky's concern for the unity of the Ukrainian nation, divided between the Russian and the Austrian empires, is quite evident: in all his works he was careful to treat the whole Ukrainian territory, from the Kuban River to the

* Mykola Rudenko, *Ekonomichni monolohy* (N.p., 1978). Podolynsky's theory recently also attracted the attention of two Spanish scholars. See J. Martinez Alier and J. M. Naredo, "A Marxist Precursor of Energy Economics: Podolynsky," *Journal of Peasant Studies* 9, no. 2 (January 1982): 207-24.

Carpathian Mountains. This, together with his demonstrated solid knowledge of Ukrainian history and keen awareness of national differences between Ukrainians and Russians, shows that Podolynsky had a highly developed sense of national consciousness.

Podolynsky's productive life was cut short at the beginning of 1882. He had just suffered a series of personal tragedies: serious conflicts with his wife; the deaths of two of his three children and of a child left in his care by a friend, due possibly to his own faulty diagnosis; and disinheritance by his father. Weakened by overwork, Podolynsky succumbed even further because of these new calamities and in early 1882 became mentally unbalanced. After several years in psychiatric institutions in France, Podolynsky was brought by his mother to Kiev in 1885. There he died without recovering in 1891.

*

There are no biographies of Podolynsky in the Western languages and only incomplete studies in Ukrainian and Russian. No collection of his works has been published. Almost completely forgotten in his lifetime, Podolynsky was presented to the Ukrainian reading public in 1922 by Mykhailo Hrushevsky, who published a short biography and a few of Podolynsky's articles in *Z pochyniv ukrainskoho sotsiialistychnoho rukhu. Mykh. Drachomanov i zhenevskiyi sotsiialistychnyi hurtok* (Vienna, 1922). A few short studies of Podolynsky appeared in the interwar period, the most complete being the pioneer work by Oleksander K. Mytsiuk, *Ukrainskyi ekonomist-hromadivets S. A. Podolynskiyi* (Lviv, 1933). In Soviet Ukraine no research was done on Podolynsky from the early 1930s until the mid-1950s. Since that time several monographs and a number of articles have appeared. The most notable are: L. Ia. Korniiichuk and I. M. Meshko, *Ekonomichni pohliady S. A. Podolynskoho* (Kiev, 1958); A. I. Pashuk, *Sotsiolo-hichni ta suspilno-politychni pohliady S. A. Podolynskoho* (Lviv, 1965); and M. P. Rudko, *Revoliutsiini narodnyky na Ukraini (70-ti roky XIX st.)* (Kiev, 1973).

Podolynsky carried on a vast correspondence with his family, friends, and political associates. Some one hundred of his letters have been published, but many remain unpublished in archives. The originals of the four documents translated below are in the Central State Archives of the October Revolution in Moscow (TsGAOR SSSR, f. 1737 (V. M. Smirnov), op. 1, del. 29, 1. 1-2, and del. 58, 1. 56-69, 70-73). Two of Podolynsky's letters and Smirnov's questionnaire were published in the original Russian by M. Rudko in his "S. A. Podolynskiy u revoliutsiino-

narodnytskomu rusi 70-kh rr. XIX st.," *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal*, 1966, no. 7, pp. 123-5 (document 1), and "Revoliutsiine narodnytstvo 70-kh rokiv XIX st. i ukrainski 'hromady' (Lyst S. A. Podolynskoho pro 'ukrainsku sotsial-demokratychnu partiui')," *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal*, 1968, no. 9, pp. 127-32 (documents 3 and 4). Typewritten copies of all four documents have also been preserved at the International Institute of Social History in Amsterdam and published by B. Sapir in *Vpered! 1873-1877*, vol. 2: *Documents* (Dodrecht-Holland, n.d. [but 1974], pp. 430-43. Because there are slight discrepancies between the Rudko and the Sapir texts, the translation of letters 1, 3 and 4 was based primarily on the Rudko version; letter 2 was translated from the only available text, which is in Sapir's *Vpered!* I have also drawn extensively on Rudko's comments to the published documents.

1

Vienna, 4 May [1875]

Valerian Nikolaevich,¹

Three months ago I received your letter, which was of a rather abusive nature, and did not answer you until now. Do not think that I got angry; that is not at all my custom. I did not answer mainly because I did not have an address, for I thought, and it later turned out to be true, that Reynhardt's address had been exposed. And I did not want to write to Lopatin's address.² Nevertheless, I did begin to write a reply but did not finish and did not send it; and now I am glad, because I began to write in a tone similar to yours, and that would have been quite

¹ Valerian Nikolaevich Smirnov (1848-1900) was expelled in 1869 from the Faculty of Medicine of Moscow University for participating in student disturbances; later he was arrested as an anarchist sympathizer. Fleeing abroad, he broke with anarchism and became Lavrov's close collaborator on the journal *Vpered!* In spite of their later political differences, Podolynsky remained Smirnov's close friend and benefactor. Smirnov lived in London at the time these letters were written.

² German Aleksandrovich Lopatin (1845-1918), a Russian revolutionary populist and Lavrov's close friend. Lopatin helped organize Lavrov's flight abroad in 1870. From 1873 to 1879 he himself lived in the West and contributed to *Vpered!* Reynhardt has not been identified. His address in Paris was used as a drop by Russian revolutionaries.

stupid on my part and, most important, against my nature. Finally, if there had been something really interesting, I would have written; but there was nothing more interesting than the list that I sent you,³ and even that, you will agree, was a rather unimportant thing, all the more so since in Russia everyone who should have known about it, did.

So, I do not wish to shrug off the matter but to excuse myself before you and Petr Lavrovich [Lavrov],⁴ or better still, to explain what I have been doing. Naturally, I have done very little. I was very ill when I left Paris in May [1874] and still have not recovered completely; but I soon will. Of course, sickness does not interfere with your work, but it interferes with mine. For six months I lived in the village and in Kiev.⁵ In the village I devoted myself almost exclusively to practicing medicine and saw almost no one beside the peasants. My success as a physician greatly exceeded my expectations. People came to see me from 40 to 50 villages, and on some days I had more than 50 patients. And I also constantly visited neighboring villages. Nevertheless, my noble rank was, of course, spoiling everything, and therefore I decided to relinquish it. I began by renouncing all income, and I intend in the fall, after returning to Russia, to buy a peasant homestead somewhere and to settle down on it.

Generally, I consider going to the people as undeniably the best form of activity, on the condition, however, that the word "going" be understood as "going over" to the people and a permanent (of course, to the extent that the police will allow it) settlement among the people.⁶ So far, of those who went to the people the overwhelming majority either got caught or returned to the intelligentsia over the winter. The first instance is, of course, the result of [bad] luck or carelessness; the second has very harmful consequences: it has already succeeded in discrediting "going to the people," reducing it to a highly emotional summer excursion. I

³ A list prepared by the Third Section in 1874 of fifty-three revolutionaries it wished to apprehend. It was published in the February 1875 issue of *Vpered!*

⁴ Peter Lavrovich Lavrov (1823-1900), one of the chief theoreticians, along with Bakunin and Tkachev, of Russian populism in the 1870s. In response to an appeal from Russian revolutionaries, conveyed to him by Aleksandr Kril and Pavel Baidakovsky, to publish a free political periodical for them abroad, Lavrov launched *Vpered!* in 1872.

⁵ The village of Iaroslavka was in Zvenyhorod district, which bordered on Kherson gubernia; it is halfway between Kiev and Odessa and allowed Podolynsky to stay in touch with groups in both cities.

⁶ Ukraine, because of its Cossack tradition and the presence of non-conformist religious sects, was a favorite target of the "movement to the people" organized by populist youth in 1874. The movement ended in failure; the police rounded up the agitators, often with the help of suspicious peasants.

think that you will fully agree with these opinions of mine and will perhaps only ask me why I have gone abroad at this time. I left for about three months, partly to cure the remains of deafness, which still afflicts me, but primarily to learn farming, which is why I will go to Serbia and Galicia, since in Russia it is now most inconvenient for a man of the gentry to learn a trade. Then, as I was saying, I shall buy a house, most likely in the sugar-beet region of Kiev gubernia; I will plant beets and sow wheat and live from that. I will look after the peasants in my capacity as a paramedic or, generally speaking, as a doctor without a diploma. This is what I will do officially; what will follow, we shall see. In this connection I should say to you, a physician, that, of course, internal medicine is in most cases nonsense; however, on the basis of the experience I have already acquired, surgery and dermatology are good things. I should add to the above that I intend to realize my plan somewhat differently than those who used to go to the people until now; namely, I intend to carry out the whole affair officially, using my own name, because first of all I can see from all previous experience that a false passport offers little protection, and besides, in the places in which I am thinking of settling, that is, in the Kiev or in another Ukrainian gubernia, I always stand the risk of running into an acquaintance; and secondly, because I have an almost insurmountable aversion to false passports.

I am writing you a great deal about myself, but it is the first time, and I probably will not write to you again about myself soon; therefore, I trust that I am not boring you too much. Besides, it took much time and energy to arrive at the present plan, which is different from the one I had before.

When we last saw each other, you told me that three things could bring down my downfall: the practice of medicine, Ukrainophilism, and Judophobia. On the basis of my stay in Kiev I can now give you this reply: I have conquered the practice of medicine, as you can see from the above; it is a well-known means of making wider contacts, etc., in the given situation, certainly nothing more. (I have not yet resolved the question of Judophobia.⁷) On the other hand, Ukrainophilism has triumphed over me; I have always had an inclination towards it, and recently I have become an utterly ardent Ukrainophile. But do not grieve. First of all, if, as I expect, you concur that the conclusions I reached

⁷ A detractive trait of an otherwise very sympathetic character was Podolynsky's anti-Semitism, which went beyond the condemnation of the nefarious activities of the Jewish village taverners and moneylenders. In a later letter Podolynsky offered to write a detailed study for *Vpered!* on the Jewish problem in Ukraine. But the offer was probably rejected, since no such article appeared.

concerning the situation of the gentry are correct, and if I tell you that the decisive factor in reaching that orientation was Ukrainophilism, then you will agree that it really is not such an awful thing.

You should know, first of all, that now Ukrainophilism means the Ukrainian Social-Democratic Party,⁸ and if there are still among the Ukrainophiles people who, deep in their hearts, do not agree with this, then they are now afraid to talk about it, because the consequence of this should have been their immediate resignation from the Ukrainophile party. But at the same time, we Ukrainophiles are nationalists to the same extent that the Serbian socialists, the English [socialists] and the other [socialists] are nationalists, and certainly not a bit more nationalist than you, the Great Russian [socialists]. Do not forget that we are a different nation and that the difference between you and us is the same as between you and the Poles, the Serbs, and others.

If, in spite of this, you as much as think of denying that the indispensability of the entire cultural and literary activity of the Ukrainian intelligentsia is valid, then you will immediately reveal yourself to be a most narrow Great Russian nationalist. Do not forget that we [the Ukrainophiles] cannot, and in particular the Ukrainian people cannot, develop in the direction of socialism using your forms, just as the Polish [people] would not be able to. Do not forget that we do not yet possess those cultural elements that you already have in part. We have not sufficiently developed the literary language (our folk language, on the other hand, is purer and more developed than yours); we have no books for the dissemination of knowledge,⁹ the necessity of which neither you nor especially Petr Lavrovich would disparage. You should understand that the forms that are quite appropriate for your people may not appeal to ours.

I will illustrate this with an example: Your publications, both *Forward!*¹⁰ and those for the [common] people (of which unfortunately,

⁸ Podolynsky is referring to the *hromady*, organizations of the Ukrainophile intelligentsia with heterogeneous social and political views but whose younger and more radical members, like Podolynsky, held views akin to those of the Western social democrats. The term "party" should be understood here in its contemporary meaning: a group of people holding some common convictions and goals rather than a structured political organization.

⁹ The publication of Ukrainian primers and popular books begun in the early 1860s in connection with the use of the Ukrainian language in the popular Sunday schools was curtailed by the Valuev circular of 1863, which banned the Ukrainian language from use in the schools and in print. As a result, the Ukrainian literary language did not become codified until much later.

there is so far only one, *The Cunning Trick*)¹¹ enjoy great success among us. No matter how many copies of them we manage to get, all immediately disappear. Excerpts from *Forward!* are read quite openly before 200 people at student meetings, for example, passages from "Revolutionaries from the Privileged Milieu."¹² *The Cunning Trick*, of which I, unfortunately, received only 20 copies, was snapped up so quickly that I could not even save a copy for myself. I never heard of any Ukrainophile finding your orientation too extreme or reproaching you with any of the many other stupid accusations that are not lacking among the Great Russian youth. Among the Ukrainophiles there are of course no centralists or hardly any, no opponents of knowledge.¹³ And yet, they are sometimes critical of your publications, but from what perspective? From the point of view of form and manner. Thus, for example, *The Cunning Trick* was very appealing except, of course, for the last chapter, which, as I heard, was added by the editors and, I must say, most unsuccessfully, for it makes a false impression and spoils the book. However, without, of course, attributing too much importance to this, everyone of us objected to the title, *The Cunning Trick*, as being extremely antipopular, having an especially boorish-charlatan [*katsapsko-sharlatanskii*] character.¹⁴ *The Cunning Trick* is being translated into our language and will probably

¹⁰ Between 1873 and 1877 five volumes of *Vpered!* came out irregularly, first in Geneva and then in London. Lavrov edited all the volumes except the last one, which was edited by Smirnov and N. G. Kuliabko-Koretsky. In 1875-76 *Vpered!* came out as a fortnightly newspaper (48 issues) in London.

¹¹ The brochure *Khitraia mekhanika* by "Andrei Ivanov" was published by the *Vpered* press in Zurich in 1874. Its author, Vasilii Egorovich Varzar (1851-1940), who was from the Moldavian noble Varzer family, enrolled in 1869 at Kiev University, where he probably met Podolynsky.

¹² Smirnov's "Revoliutsionery iz privileirovannoi sredy," *Vpered!* 2 (1874): 122-55, was based on Podolynsky's activity. The author paints a jaundiced picture of his friend's revolutionary potential.

¹³ *Vpered!* advocated federalism and held that the first duty of the intelligentsia was to spread knowledge among the common people. Both these ideas were condemned by most Russian radicals, who upheld centralism and more direct political action. Eventually the latter tendencies became identified with Tkachev and his journal, *The Tocsin (Nabat)*.

¹⁴ *Katsap: kak tsap* (like a goat), a traditional Ukrainian derogatory term for Russians referring to the beard once commonly worn by Russians (Ukrainians usually wore only a moustache). The Russian derogatory term for Ukrainians is *khokhol*, the name of the scalp lock sported by Ukrainian Cossacks on their otherwise shaved heads. It is not clear why the Ukrainians objected to the title "Khitraia mekhanika." The last chapter was added by Smirnov.

soon appear in print.¹⁵ Similarly, *A Tale of Four Brothers*,¹⁶ being simpler than *The Cunning Trick*, is even more appealing, especially to the peasants.

Of course, Ukrainians overdo it in another way. If you have read the tale *Zaporozhians*, which was published in Kiev and passed by the censor, then you will, of course, agree that it is superior in literary talent and artistry to everything that is printed abroad, and that even under the circumstances, that it has undergone censorship, it is hardly inferior in its social-revolutionary aspect to anything published abroad.¹⁷ (It was passed by the same censor who passed *Grandpa Egor*¹⁸ and who, in fact, takes bribes from Ukrainophiles; and therefore it would be better for you not to write about him. These bribes, by the way, do not prevent him from terribly cutting down *The Kiev Telegraph*¹⁹ to the extent that some

¹⁵ Translated into Ukrainian by Podolynsky, the brochure appeared in Vienna in 1875 under the title *The Truth (Pravda)*.

¹⁶ *Skazka o chetyrekh bratiakh*, a populist brochure by L. A. Tikhomirov, was published by the Geneva press of the Chaikovtsy in 1873. Two independent Ukrainian translations were made at the same time, one by Podolynsky, and the other by P. P. Pukhyniuk, a student at Kiev University, under the title "What Is and What Will Be" (*Shcho ie ta shcho bude*). Neither translation was published.

¹⁷ Ivan Nechui[-Levytsky], *Zaporozhysi. Kazka (Zaporozhians. A Tale)*, first published in the Lviv journal *Pravda*, 1873, no. 11, pp. 384-92; no. 12, pp. 417-24; no. 13, pp. 444-56; and then as a separate offprint in Lviv in 1873 and in Kiev in 1874. Using the form of a fairy tale, the author describes an idyllic Cossack community magically preserved at the bottom of the Dnieper near the rapids and contrasts it with the existing misery of the Ukrainian people under the tsar and the foreign exploiting classes. *Zaporozhysi* undoubtedly inspired Podolynsky to write his *Parova mashyna* as a fairy tale, in which the ideal society is no longer Cossackdom, but a future socialist Ukraine.

¹⁸ *Dedushka Egor (Rasskaz)* was first published in *Nedelia* (Saint Petersburg) in 1870, nos. 30 and 31, over the signature N.P. It was republished legally in the form of a brochure, first in Kiev (1872) and then in Saint Petersburg (1873). The author, Maria K. Tsebrikova (1835-?) was a great-granddaughter of Ukrainian cossack, Maksym Tsebryk, who added the ending "ov" to his name. The brochure related the story of the punishment and exile to Siberia of the peasant Egor, who rebelled against the authorities in protest of the unjust taxation of the peasantry. The pamphlet enjoyed great popularity among the populists and was translated into Ukrainian by Feliks Volkhovsky but never published, probably owing to Volkhovsky's arrest in 1874.

¹⁹ *Kievskii telegraf*, the first important newspaper published in Kiev; a biweekly from 1859 to 1863 and a triweekly from 1864 to 1876. In 1875 the Kiev Hromada attempted, with some success, to transform it into its own Ukrainophile organ. The newspaper was closed down by the authorities on 1 June 1876, after the 71st issue.

of us, and namely those who contribute most to it, have already proposed closing down the paper voluntarily.) And so, the tale *Zaporozhians* also sins, first of all by idealizing the Cossacks, and secondly by its excessive aesthetic form, which makes it too difficult for the common people to understand.

Our most immediate objective, that is, of those Ukrainophiles who will not be working directly among the people, is to organize abroad the regular publication of books for the people and then also a journal for the people; the latter, of course, is a very difficult objective, impossible to realize sooner than in a year or two. Therefore, do not be angry that now we are not working directly for *Forward!* and your publications. The reason is not a lack of sympathy, but the realization of the urgency of setting up a similar [publishing enterprise] of our own that would, of course, observe our own national particularities and, I shall say it bluntly, even tastes, which we, and particularly our people, treasure. Personally, I am very sorry that I cannot continue the work I began in *Forward!*, but I trust that if you and Petr Lavrovich learn that I am fulfilling the objectives expressed in the first half of my letter, then you will willingly and even with satisfaction free me from the promise I had given you.

I would like very much to see you, but I have no money for the trip, because I took from my father only as much as was necessary to realize my plans and do not wish to take more. If you ever come to Russia, then be assured that in Kiev, or wherever I will be living, you will always be greeted with joy.

Unfortunately, I have recently seriously and quite needlessly undermined my position vis-à-vis the police. Namely, I was dragged to gendarme headquarters as a witness in connection with the search for Kablits²⁰ and the arrest of Volkenshtein,²¹ at whose place Kablits stayed, and in the course of the last month I had almost daily meetings there, which was extremely unpleasant.

I will soon send you my address; at the moment I am still not sure of it myself. Tomorrow I am leaving Vienna.

Yours, S. P[odolynsky].

[Added to the first page of the letter:]

There are not enough copies in Kiev or anywhere else of the third volume of *Forward!* or of the newspaper.²² The Jew and the Tashken-

²⁰ Iosif Ivanovich Kablits (1848-93), a Bakuninist who participated in the movement to the people and then fled abroad to escape arrest.

²¹ Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Volkenshtein (1852-19—) a student at Kiev University and member of the "Kiev commune" in 1874 who helped Kablits flee abroad.

²² The third volume of *Vpered!* came out in London in 1874.

tian²³ were both in Kiev but accomplished nothing; the first has already been abroad for nothing, and the second will probably go later as well.

Do not forget that most of your Petersburg friends are Ukrainians and that many intend to resettle in Ukraine, where they will certainly take the side of Ukrainophilism, since in its current form it will become irresistible to every Ukrainian radical.

Please read my letter to Petr Lavrovich. Give my regards to R[ozalia] Kh[rystoforovna]²⁴ and Linev.²⁵

2

Hall, 5 May [1875]

My address: Ober-Oesterreich, Hall bei Steyer, poste restante²⁶

I cannot refrain from writing you a few more words about a subject that is very close to you and to us, namely about books for the common people. Until now you have published only *The Cunning Trick*, a wonderful book, but it's the only one. Of course, it is our fault that we [in Russia] do not write more; but you will agree that along with all the petty troubles and disturbances that fill our lives in Russia; in the midst of continuous conflicts with the police and with other riffraff; in the face of constant failures, all of which befall namely those people who could write something; very few of us have enough peace of mind and freedom for intellectual work, so that we could do something decent. You [who are living abroad] are in a different situation: to be sure, you are possibly even busier than we are, but then you are relatively undisturbed and free. I am being direct: the newspaper *Forward!* is very interesting and important for me and for many others like me, but the question is

²³ Pseudonyms of Lev Savelevich Ginzburg (1851-1919), a Saint Petersburg Lavrovist and contributor to *Vpered!* and Ievhen Stepanovych Semianovsky (1850-81), a Ukrainian member of Ginzburg's Lavrovist circle.

²⁴ Rozaliia Khristoforovna Idelson, the common-law wife of Smirnov, worked for *Vpered!*

²⁵ Aleksandr Logvinovich Linev (c. 1843-1918) helped Lavrov with the technical side of *Vpered!*

²⁶ Podolynsky went to Hall bei Steyer, Upper Austria, for a rest; the date in the letter is not clear: it could be 5, 7 or 9 May.

not about us. If instead of No. 8 [of *Forward!*] you put out two books for the people, it would involve less work for you but bring immeasurably greater benefits. You have had [manuscripts of] good “butterflies”²⁷ (that is what we call books for the people), for example, on military service, lying about for two years, yet you have not published them. Judge for yourself and you will agree that I am right. Besides, both you and Linev could write if the latter had more free time. You must agree that it is not worth publishing a newspaper so that 3 copies of it can reach Petersburg and usually half a year later. Meanwhile a “butterfly” does not lose its worth even when it is received a year after [publication]. I shall say more: start publishing “butterflies” systematically, and one of us Ukrainophiles will settle down immediately on the border, something neither we nor the Great Russians, for whom it should have been more appropriate to do, have done for *Forward!* until now. As you can see, in no way are we narrow-minded nationalists, and if we can, we will even write “butterflies” in the Great Russian literary-popular language and send them to you.

Do not be surprised that we cannot send you any money. We have very little of it, and what we do have is spent by our communities in Ukraine. We no longer have connections with rich people, and those that formerly existed with pro-Ukrainophile aristocrats, whom... [missing passage] none, and it is not worth bothering the typesetters with trash.

Please reply as completely and as sincerely as I write to you.

3

[Smirnov's questions to Podolynsky concerning the Ukrainian movement (from the author's rough draft):]

London, May 1875.

Sergei Andreevich,

In order to prepare a “serious” reply to your letter, I must get from you very detailed and definitive explanations to the following questions:

1. What constitutes the programme of the “Ukrainian social-democratic party”? What are its political and social ideas? What is its attitude

²⁷ Podolynsky used *metelyky*, the Ukrainian word for butterflies (in Russian *babochki*). *Metelyky* were small-format brochures and books published in Ukrainian since the 1860s and meant primarily for the Ukrainian peasantry.

to the existing political and social order? What will its activity in the nearest future consist of?

2. What is the relationship between the Ukr[ainian] party and the social-revolutionaries in Russia and *Forward!*? What is the attitude of the Ukrainian party to the Great Russian workers and Great Russian intellectuals living in Ukraine? What is the attitude of the members of the Ukrainian party living in Great Russia to the Great Russian workers and the social-revolutionaries in whose midst they live?
3. What is the relationship between the Ukrainian social-democratic party and the social-revolutionary parties of Germany and Austria and the international revolutionary party? How does it comprehend the national question? What is its relationship with "Young Galicia," whose organ is *The Truth*?²⁸
4. What is the attitude of the party to *The Kiev Telegraph*? Can the editorials, the feuilletons, or the various other articles be considered an expression of the views of the party, even if the said articles have been cut up by the censors? Which articles were written by you personally?
5. When and how did the party appear? How strong is it and to what extent is it a manifestation of the "Ukrainian youth"? How successful has its propaganda and its organization been?
6. Your letter contains the following passage: "If [...] you as much as think of denying that the indispensability of the entire cultural and literary activity of the Ukrainian intelligentsia is valid, then you will immediately reveal yourself to be a most narrow Great Russian nationalist." How is this sentence to be understood in general, and more specifically, what is meant by the words "cultural and literary activity," and who should be understood as being part of the Ukrainian intelligentsia?
7. Another passage: "Do not forget that we cannot, and in particular the Ukrainian people cannot, develop in the direction of socialism using your forms, just as the Polish [people], the Serbs would not be able to. Do not forget that we do not yet possess those cultural elements that you already have in part." How is this entire sentence to be understood in general, and what do you mean by "our" forms and by "cultural elements"?

²⁸ *Pravda* (1867-96), a literary and political journal published in Lviv by Ukrainian populists (*narodovtsi*). In 1873, Podolynsky contributed to it a report on the evening commemorating Shevchenko organized by students in Zurich. By the "international revolutionary party" Smirnov meant the Workers' International.

I would ask you to answer each question in as much detail as possible. Besides, it is as much in your interest as it is in ours to avoid misunderstandings.

Awaiting a speedy reply,

V[alerian] S[mirnov]

4

Hall bei Steyer, Ober-Oesterreich

17 May [1875]

I received your letter today and began writing a reply immediately because it is very easy to answer almost all of your questions. Many of your questions, namely the theoretical ones, seem to be superfluous, and I think that they were answered in my first letter and by the very term "Ukrainian social-democratic party." However, for the sake of total clarity, I shall reply to them as well.

1. The U[krainian] s[ocial]-d[emocratic] p[arty], like the Russian [party], does not represent a fully organized and structured unit and consequently, of course, cannot have a preliminary programme like the ones drawn up, for example, by the German or other West European parties.²⁹ Nevertheless, on various occasions, as, for example, when reaching a consensus with the radicals³⁰ (this is how people here refer to you and to the pan-Russian social democrats in general, and this is the term I shall use here for the sake of brevity) or in the struggle with the liberals, many [a Ukrainian] came out with a programme not of his own making, but of his circle, his party, or generally as circumstances demanded. On those occasions, Ukrainians often did what the Russian radicals usually do not do, that is, they proposed [not just theoretical but] even practical solutions for the basic questions of their ideal order, which was most imminent. At the same time, economic questions were formulated in accordance with the decisions of the Brussels and Basel congresses of

²⁹ The German Social Democratic Labour Party was founded at the Eisenach Congress in 1869, where it adopted what is known as the Eisenach programme. An Austrian party was formed at the Neudorf Congress in 1874, where it adopted a similar programme.

³⁰ Negotiations between Ukrainian and Russian revolutionaries took place in Zurich in the summer of 1873, in Kiev in 1874, and in Odessa in 1876.

1868-69,³¹ with, of course, [the proposals for] the complete termination of the capitalist method of production, of the sale of labour, and of similar elements of the contemporary economy, which slipped into de Paepe's article of 1874.³² Of course, all this was formulated so that it would apply to Russia and especially to Ukraine. The solutions to the questions of the transfer of land to the peasant communes³³ and of the factories to the workers' artels³⁴ are self-evident and are, of course, no longer discussed in the party.

On political questions, the U.s.d.p. has become increasingly similar to the anarchists of Western Europe, although, as it turned out, not to such extreme anarchists as the Spaniards, but rather to the Jurassians or the Belgian anarchist group. [Our] immediate ideal is a feasibly decentralized federation with the greatest possible communal self-government. At this point it is, of course, still premature to discuss the question of the size of the federation;³⁵ I will say, however, that there are extreme separatists—for example, many Poltavians—and then those who are more inclined towards pan-Russian radicalism—for example, the Right-

³¹ The third and fourth congresses of the First International in Brussels (1868) and Basel (1869) passed resolutions in favour of collective land ownership.

³² César de Paepe (1841-90), a leading Belgian socialist, played a prominent role in the Brussels and Basel congresses, where he tried to reconcile Marx and Bakunin. After the split at the Hague Congress in 1872, de Paepe supported the federalist, Bakuninist International. The article mentioned by Podolynsky is de Paepe's report read to the Seventh (Brussels) Congress of the Bakuninist International. The report was published as a brochure—*Association internationale des travailleurs, De l'organisation des services publics dans la société future. Mémoire présenté au Congrès de Bruxelles au nom de la section bruxelloise en 1874* (Brussels, 1874)—and republished in 1875 in London in Lavrov's translation and with his introduction and comments as *Obshchestvennaia sluzhba v budushchem obshchestve*. In it de Paepe developed his ideas expressed in the 1868 and 1869 congresses, namely, that the future state would be composed of a federation of free communes.

³³ Many Ukrainian socialists, like Podolynsky, accepted the Russian socialists' faith in the socialist qualities of the peasant *obshchina* and applied it to the future organization in Ukraine even though they were aware of the fact that the Ukrainian peasant *hromada* was essentially an association of private land owners and that the genuine *obshchina* organization touched only a small portion of Ukrainian lands. Later Podolynsky accepted the notion of private property without hired help.

³⁴ Workers' artels existed in Ukraine, as in Russia.

³⁵ Podolynsky implies that the discussion would be between those who wanted an internally federated but externally independent Ukraine and those who were for a broader, pan-Slavic or pan-European federation.

Bankers and the Chernihivians.³⁶ Of course, we settle religious questions in the same way that you and all the other radicals do.³⁷ The same applies to the questions of the situation of women, of the family, and so on, although here, of course, national characteristics come strongly into their own. The Ukrainian woman was never in as servile a position as the Great Russian [woman], and consequently the [women's] emancipation movement [in Ukraine] is not as energetic [as in Russia]. The Ukrainian woman, and particularly the [Ukrainian] girl, whether she comes from the [common] people or from the upper strata, is even now in an incomparably better position than the Great Russian [woman], and cases of family tyranny are on the whole rarer.

As I wrote to you before, there are, of course, people with insufficiently sincere convictions, and the U.s.d.p. still needs a proper purge; nevertheless, the social-democratic element dominates to the extent that, in general, even theoretically we can preclude the existence of any other party among the Ukrainophiles besides the s.d.—if one disregards the few pitiful remnants of the Cossackophiles, who are dying out.³⁸ The Ukrainians are for the most part a peasant people; there is no other nation in the world that has such a low percentage of upper strata, and therefore no Ukrainian movement has any purpose from the start if it is not purely peasant[-oriented].³⁹ Ukrainophiles have always been called peasant lovers [*khlopomany*] and have justly been proud of that name, which they had earned while being still rather narrow nationalists.⁴⁰ Now, after a part of them has switched and a part is still in the process of switching over to the international s.-d. position, they will have an even greater right to bear this name, which shows clearly that in essence they were never a *national*⁴¹ party in the conventional sense of the word. And

³⁶ A reference to the various *hromady* that existed in the main Ukrainian centres.

³⁷ Podolynsky believed in religious tolerance; religion was to be dislodged by science.

³⁸ Cossackophiles—Romantics who longed for the return of the old Cossack ways.

³⁹ In Ukraine the upper class was composed of Polish nobles in the Right Bank, and of Russian and Russified Ukrainian Cossack nobles in the Left Bank; the new bourgeois strata were also of non-Ukrainian backgrounds (Russian, Polish, Jewish, German), while most Ukrainians who climbed up the social ladder tended to become quickly Russified.

⁴⁰ Polish nobles in Right-Bank Ukraine used the term *chlopomanie*, or "peasant-lovers," to taunt university students who at the end of the 1850s and early 1860s showed concern for the fate of the peasants and for the "peasant" (that is, Ukrainian) language, culture, and nationality. Many of these students came from Polish or Polonized Ukrainian families.

⁴¹ Underlined by Podolynsky.

in fact, who in Russia first showed the way "to the people" if not the peasant lovers?⁴² In the years 1860-63, the peasant lovers went to the people in the same way, with the same objectives, and used the same methods, as the radicals do today. At that time they were caught and suffered almost as much [as radicals today]. And even now, if you look at the lists, you will see how disproportionately large is the number of Ukrainians among those who have "gone to the people."

Of course, now you will say that these are not Ukrainophiles but radicals. But my answer is that many of them are both one and the other (for example, Volkhovsky)⁴³ even now; it is only due to chance that many of them are not Ukrainophiles; for example, they were brought up outside Ukraine, know the [Ukrainian] language badly, initially became involved with Great Russian groups, and so on. Finally, and this is most important, they will certainly become Ukrainophiles as soon as they return to Ukraine and see the present orientation of the Ukrainophile movement. But that is not half of it. Last year the radicals went to the people, but whether they will stay, I do not know. Ukrainophiles, although, of course, not in large numbers, have stayed since the sixties. I know some of them, and I know that their activities were as socially revolutionary as was possible in such a dead period as was the end of the sixties and the beginning of the seventies. Finally, among the Ukrainophiles today the problem is never broached otherwise than as a question of a purely popular movement and, for the intelligentsia, activity among the people. Here, of course, distinctive national characteristics come into play once again. We dislike and consider of little value itinerant activity, "on the road," as some radicals put it. Our objective is to [permanently] settle throughout Ukraine. Owing to the overwhelming preponderance of the peasant population, our aims are understandably directed primarily at the settled element in the population.

You should note as well that for us such a transfer [to the village] is neither difficult nor very frightening. It is true that it is now impossible to register officially with a peasant community (previously Ukrainophiles used to gain entrance in this way), but it is not at all difficult to

⁴² The activity of the *khlopomany* among the common people extended from combatting illiteracy by organizing Sunday schools and composing Ukrainian primers to political agitation among the peasantry and the soldiers.

⁴³ Feliks Vadymovych Volkhovsky (1846-1914), a Ukrainian revolutionary active in the Russian movement who in 1874 wrote the brochure *A True Message of An Agriculturalist to His Fellow Peasants* (*Pravdyve slovo khliboroba do svoikh zemliakiv* [Vienna, 1876]). The brochure, published by Ostap Terletsky, was seized by the Austrian authorities, and the publisher was tried in the first trial of socialists in Austria.

become a peasant-homesteader (*khutorianyn*),⁴⁴ and even for most of us, the children of small and often very small gentry, it will not constitute anything out of the ordinary, attracting [undue] attention. In the past some [of the peasant lovers] married peasant women, and now others [Ukrainophiles] are thinking of doing the same. As you can see, the value of such a move to the people will be much higher than that of a two- or three-month summer excursion on the banks of the Volga or even of temporary work in a factory. You will ask, of course, what these Ukrainophiles will say to the peasants. Of course, they will say, and are saying now, various things and in various ways, but it all comes down to the following: the land is yours, the factories, etc., also, the means [of appropriation]—seizure by way of a popular revolution. This is the way Ukrainophiles think, and only time will tell if they are right. Of course, work in the villages does not make work in the cities unnecessary. Something is being done on that score even now, and when the Ukrainian workers' movement appears—and it is already taking shape—then still more will be done. Here is a fact that illustrates how even our middle strata began to regard physical labour: in the Kiev trade school (which is partly Ukrainophile), the greater part of the pupils are children of officials, priests, and so on. In 3 to 4 years many of them will inevitably join the ranks of social democracy and in this way will crown the workers' movement in Kiev, which had its beginnings in the Sunday schools run by the Ukrainophiles in the sixties, the results of which were utilized by the radicals at the beginning of the seventies.⁴⁵ It is remarkable that many of these people remained faithful [to their cause] to this day, while many of the radicalized newcomers (for example, the famous Gavrila,⁴⁶ about whom you heard from little Kuliabka⁴⁷ and others) turned into renegades.

At the first opportunity we will set up abroad a workers', that is, a people's, newspaper, and then, of course, things will go much better. The same, of course, goes for the publication of popular books. There's my answer to your first question.

⁴⁴ Owner of a *khutir*, a separate farmstead, common in the steppe region of Ukraine.

⁴⁵ There were over one hundred Sunday schools in Ukraine in the years 1859-62, mainly catering to working-class youth in urban centres. Beside teaching the rudiments of literacy, some radical student-teachers used the schools to foster social awareness and spread revolutionary doctrines.

⁴⁶ Gavrila, surname unknown; a carpenter promoted as a model by P. B. Akselrod in Kiev in the early 1870s.

⁴⁷ Oleksander Hryhorovych Kuliabko-Koretsky, a student at Kiev University. During the summer holidays of 1873 he met Lavrov in Zurich and worked for a while as typesetter for *Vpered!*

2. Relations between the Ukrainians and the [Russian] radicals, previously strained, are improving by the day. Ukrainophiles often meet with various radical factions, of which there are several in Ukraine, i.e., anarchists, Vperedists, and others, even though the radicals as a whole are not very numerous. It is true that the complete fusion to which the Ukrainophiles drank at the banquet commemorating Shevchenko has not yet been achieved,⁴⁸ but mutual help, especially on the part of the Ukrainophiles, is very common. It is interesting to note that the various factions of radicals often turn more readily to the Ukrainophiles than to each other [for help] in difficult situations, for example, to hide, to get money, to distribute books. The distribution of your publications, unfortunately in extremely small quantities, has lately also been in our hands, so that the radicals also acquired them mostly through us. In general, if relations between the Ukrainophiles and the Great Russian radicals are, or better still were, very strained, then practically the only reason was the refusal on the part of the Great Russians to recognize the Ukrainian people as a separate nation. Sometimes this non-recognition was expressed openly; at other times it expressed itself indirectly, for example, in going to the Little Russian people without knowing its language. Such an approach to the matter, you will agree, is preposterous, and I am convinced that no matter how close you would be with, say, Wróblewski on the questions of international socialism, if you began to deny the existence of a separate Polish people and began to conduct propaganda in Poland in a language not understood by the Poles, then your friendship with Wróblewski would soon come to an end.⁴⁹ The better Great Russian radicals now agree fully with this [position], and wishing to be active in Ukraine, they learn its language, customs, etc., and in these circumstances enjoy in their activity the complete sympathy of the Ukrainophiles.

There is one more reason, rather of a technical nature, for the divergence [between the two movements]. The reason is, on one hand, the carelessness of the radicals, their indiscretion, their passion for correspondence, and so on; and on the other, perhaps the excessive cautiousness (though more in theory than in practice) of the Ukrainophiles and, as a result, a seemingly less energetic activity. In addition, there is still the way many radicals behave under interrogation, that is, they divulge a great deal. This, of course, does not apply by any means to everyone,

⁴⁸ This could be a reference to the commemorative evening organized by Podolynsky in Zurich in 1873 or to a similar event organized by the Kiev Hromada in 1875.

⁴⁹ Walery Wróblewski (1836-1908) took part in the Polish Insurrection of 1863 and the Paris Commune of 1871; he lived abroad in London, was a member of the General Council of the First International, and kept close ties with *Vpered!*

and not even to the majority. Of the few Ukrainophiles who were recently picked up at the same time as the radicals, none, as far as I know, gave anything away. That there really is less blabbing among the Ukrainophiles is demonstrated by the fact that those in hiding whose whereabouts were known to dozens of Ukrainophiles at the time could remain for weeks and even months in one place, even though, as it later turned out, the police were far from indifferent to these matters and attributed great importance to some of these fugitives.⁵⁰ Our radical circles can hardly offer similar examples [of such conspiracy].

Ukrainophiles are better disposed towards *Forward!* than, I am convinced, the Great Russian radicals. But this is understandable. For us *Forward!* is a wonderful publication, founded on the principles of international socialism, which are dear to us; besides, it is written in a language we all understand and provides us with information about our country [Ukraine] as well. There can be no rivalry between us and *Forward!*—as there is in fact among the various Great Russian circles—as there can be none, for example, between *Volksstaat*⁵¹ and, say, the Croatian *R[adnicki] Pr[ijatelj]*.⁵² The situation is different among the Great Russian radicals. There they argue about whether *Forward!* is an organ of the party or even, perhaps, a harmful journal, in which some articles deserve to be burned and so on. Similar nonsense could never enter our heads, just as no one could ever think of burning *Volksstaat*, and so on. We recognize that *Forward!* brings nothing but benefit to the Ukrainian intelligentsia, and I have never heard any opinion to the contrary among the Ukrainophiles. This [attitude] is so widespread that when we discuss the establishment of a [Ukrainian] revolutionary organ abroad, many call it “our *Forward!*” or declare that it must be “like *Forward!*” when reference is made to an organ for the intelligentsia. Here you have our attitude towards *Forward!* The main reason why we do not support it actively is, of course, the same reason why we do not support actively, say, *Volksstaat*; this, by the way, is not completely so, however, because some help does go [to *Forward!*] in the form of correspondence, and in other forms.

This applies to literature for the people to an even greater extent. In spite of the fact that such publications as [*The Cunning*] *Trick*, *The*

⁵⁰ This could be a reference to the refuge given by Podolynsky himself to the revolutionary Ukrainophile S. Topchaievsky after his flight from prison in 1874.

⁵¹ *Der Volksstaat*, central organ of the German social democrats edited by W. Liebknecht and published in Leipzig from 1869 to 1876.

⁵² *Radnicki Prijatelj* (Worker's Friend). A socialist periodical published in Zagreb in 1874.

Four Brothers, and others are somewhat unintelligible to the Ukrainian [common] people, the Ukrainophiles promote them with the utmost zeal. Unfortunately, we receive few of these [books], but no matter how many copies of the above-mentioned titles we do get, they are snapped up almost immediately. I admit that I am amazed as to how the police could have seized, for example, *The Four Brothers* in storage, where the books had lain for a long time. Such things could not happen here: even such a rather specialized work as *The Samara Famine* was bought up quite quickly from me in Kiev in quantities of 30-40 copies.⁵³ *The Reign of Pugachev* was least readily purchased in spite of the fact that the book is small.⁵⁴ When I asked "Why?", I was usually told that "it's declamation." In *Forward!* our people particularly like "The Chronicle of the Workers' Movement."⁵⁵ "What Is Happening in Our Fatherland" produces a lesser effect, because Ukrainophile youth, for the most part, has grown up in closer contact with the people than the [Russian] radicals, and therefore there is really nothing new for it in that section.⁵⁶

Excerpts from "Revolutionaries from the Privileged Milieu" were read [here] at a meeting in the dining hall as an argument against the so-called "Juridical Circle," adherents of laissez faire, laissez passer. Of course, this public reading at a gathering of 150-200 people provoked a storm that led to personal insults, fisticuffs, etc. The end result was that at one meeting an overwhelming majority of something like 130 to 15 expressed its solidarity with the readers of the excerpts. I usually do not attend student meetings, but that time I happened to go and even presided over it. I was amazed by the advance in the last two years of the freedom, or rather of the boldness, of expression. You should notice that now such discussions take place in Russia not inside one's own party, but in the face of the enemy, in the presence of known spies. Indeed, the police know perfectly well about everything that happens at similar gatherings, as I discovered on this occasion. Several days later I was summoned to police headquarters in connection with another case; there the assistant director of the police very politely discussed with me the "meeting at

⁵³ *Po povodu samarskogo goloda* (On the Samara Famine). Brochure written by Lavrov and published by the Vpered press in London in 1874.

⁵⁴ 1773-1873. *V pamiat stoletiiia pugachevshchiny* (On the Hundreth Anniversary of the Reign of Pugachev). A brochure put out by the Vperedists in London in 1874.

⁵⁵ "Letopis rabocheho dvizheniia" was a regular column in *Vpered!* written by Smirnov.

⁵⁶ "Chto delaetsia na rodine?" was a regular feature article of *Vpered!* often written by Lavrov.

which you, apparently, presided." The reader of the excerpts (Shulhyn,⁵⁷ a relative of the editor of *The Kievite*,⁵⁸ if you can imagine) was told that if he attended just one more meeting he would be arrested. Since he categorically refused to stay away from meetings, the students were forced to postpone for some time the larger gatherings. I am telling you this for no particular reason but simply for general interest, as a sign of the times.

I don't completely understand your question about [our] attitude to the Great Russian workers living in Ukraine. Is it that you think that the Ukrainophiles view Great Russian workers with hostility, as representatives of an exploiting nation, in the same way that Engels wrote [about it] in *Volksstaat*?⁵⁹ This would be so ridiculous that it isn't even worth talking about. As far as their efforts are concerned, the Ukrainophiles do, in fact, direct them more readily (and only) towards the Ukrainians, first, because they [the Ukrainian population] are a settled element, and secondly, because no one else but the Ukrainophiles can influence them meaningfully, while, on the other hand, the Great Russian radicals are more useful to the Great Russian workers.

3. The relations of the U[krainian] socialists with Western European [socialists], to the extent that such relations exist, are the same as those of [the Russian] radicals; but, of course, no special direct relations exist (some contacts are now being established), just as [they do not exist] for [the Russian] radicals. Ukrainophiles resolve the national question in the same way as the Western socialists, that is, [they consider] that nationality offers a very convenient grouping for economic self-administration both now and probably [will continue to do so] as long as differences between languages and other national peculiarities survive. (See the note by de Paepe.) This, of course, does not in the least diminish the significance of a world federation in all those aspects of social life that are a common interest for all mankind.

Your question about [our] relations with *Truth* was also answered indirectly in my first letter, when I spoke of founding a new organ. Is *Truth* really an organ of any social-democratic party? For two years now it persistently has not printed a single article from Kiev or even from

⁵⁷ Iakiv Mykhailovych Shulhyn (1851-1911), a member of the Kiev Hromada and later the Odessa Hromada who turned over 12,000 of his 15,000-ruble inheritance to the Ukrainophile cause; he helped Drahomanov publish the journal *Hromada*.

⁵⁸ *Kievljanin* (1864-1917), a Ukrainophobe Russian-language newspaper published by the professor of history at Kiev University, Vitalii Iakovych Shulhyn (1822-78).

⁵⁹ It is not clear which passages in Engels's articles Podolynsky had in mind.

the Sich [society] in Vienna, so that there is no need to speak about *Truth*.⁶⁰ It represents an obstacle in our eyes that can only be used to spite us, but no one more familiar with the internal affairs of the Ukrainian and Galician circles would ever use it against us. *Truth* is the sin of one Lviv and one Poltava circle;⁶¹ yet all Ukrainophiles are made to answer for it.

4. The question of the *K[iev] T[elegraph]* is somewhat more complex. Of course, it is also not a party organ, because a censored journal cannot be an organ of a revolutionary party. But since we are on that topic, show me at least [one] censored Russian journal of recent years that has dared to say what *K.T.* has said. Consider the following articles: the editorial on Jews in one of the first issues, the feuilleton on dwellings, where after [glib] descriptions not found in *Forward!* it is stated that no matter what is done now, it will lead nowhere unless there is a radical economic transformation. You gave Leonard a dressing down; [you should] read how *K.T.* took him to task.⁶² Read the article about the workers in the sugar refineries and note the words preceding the conclusion. Read the correspondence "Working on the Land." To the extent that I have been able to read censored publicistic literature, the article "Joint-Stock Companies" was the first to pose openly the question of the iron law of wages and of the fact that [workers'] associations have an educational significance only as a means of leading the workers to the complete realization of the ideal form, that is, the complete alienation of capital, and, since the human conditions of work are now more important, of supplying the workers with leisure time [necessary] for the preliminary actions for the transformation. Note that the censor already had his knuckles rapped after the first issue; that after 2-3 weeks three special instructions came from Piter [Saint Petersburg]; that more denun-

⁶⁰ Sich was a Ukrainian student organization in Vienna made up of students from Galicia and Bukovyna. Through contact with Podolynsky and other radical young Ukrainophiles from Russian Ukraine, many of the leading members of Sich were won over to socialism, the most outstanding of them being O. Terletsky. *Pravda* did publish some information about Vienna and Zurich student life, but its editor Barvinsky found much of this activity too radical, and when Podolynsky's brochures came out he submitted them to a long criticism.

⁶¹ The initial funds for launching *Pravda* were raised by the Poltava Hromada and consisted mainly of a large donation from Ielysaveta Mylodovych.

⁶² "O naime rabochikh v selskom khoziaistve," by the Russian economist P. S. Leonard, was published in *Golos*, 1875, no. 19. A critical review of the article was published by *Kievskii telegraf* on 21 February 1875. Signed only with the initial "N", the article is attributed by some historians to Mykola Ziber and by others to Fedir Vovk.

ciations were written against *K.T.* in three months than against *Forward!* in three years; that being a contributor to *K.T.* is almost as criminal as being a contributor to *Forward!* (The police know perfectly well that Al. Kuliabka⁶³ is a contributor to *Forward!* and about me as well, but there is hardly any persecution for that now.) Note that the censor (even though he is paid off) sometimes does not let through even reprints from foreign newspapers, that in order to get in several pointed words one must write entire pages of nonsense to mask them; and then try figuring it all out.

And in spite of all this, *K.T.* does not belong to the party. Not only is Gogotskaia not close [to the Ukrainophiles], she is actually hostile, and her husband is almost a spy.⁶⁴ The party committed an error in making public many names of the [paper's] contributors, which gave the impression that this was its paper; meanwhile, the truth is completely different. For the party cannot even have a [legal] newspaper; it does not have *one* member sufficiently acceptable [to the authorities] for [the authorities] to grant permission to put out a newspaper. There is no need to state that the party does not spend one kopek on the paper. Many of us repeatedly raised the question of abandoning the paper, for it was naive to get involved in such an affair and it was not worth soiling one's hands. If we do not abandon it, it is mainly because *K.T.* is daily, so to speak, on the verge of being closed down (by the administration), and we find it more convenient to have it suppressed, notwithstanding all its moderation, than to abandon it ourselves. Besides, the party had very poor control over the *Telegraph*, especially in the beginning, and therefore it was possible for totally unsuitable things to appear in it. To satisfy your curiosity, I will say that I wrote only the editorial article on the joint-stock companies and the feuilletons on ponds and on the Russian and Polish population of Galicia. Whether anything [else] was printed after my departure, I do not know.⁶⁵

⁶³ See n. 47.

⁶⁴ From 1874, no. 123, to the end, the publisher was A. I. Gogotskaia, wife of Silvestr Gogotsky, a weak-willed, reactionary professor of philosophy at Kiev University.

⁶⁵ At least six articles written by Podolynsky and signed P. or S.P. appeared in *Kievskii telegraf* in 1875: 1) "Meshchansko-rabochiia tovarishchestva samopomoshchi v Galitsii," no. 53; 2) "Putevyia zametki. II. Ot Lvova do Pesta," no. 63; 3) "Iz putevykh zametok. III. Buda-Pest, Gorod Raitsov," no. 67; 4) "Iz putevykh zametok. K statistike Vengerskago korolevstva," no. 70; 5) "Iz putevykh zametok. IV. Bogatyi krai," no. 80; 6) "Putevyia zametki. Ot Tselovtsa do Liubliany," no. 89. (I am indebted for this information to John-Paul Himka of the University of Alberta).

I must tell you that generally I find your prevailing wholesale criticism of our press in *Forward!* inconsiderate. It would be another matter if you were to demonstrate that it is impossible to have a decent press today and that it would be better not to publish at all than to put out those newspapers and journals that appear now. I would agree with that completely; but you do not do that. A blank condemnation is unkind because, believe me, *Week*⁶⁶ and *K.T.*, for example, are both able and willing to take a radical stand no less than *Forward!*, and if they had a greater number of literary forces they could accomplish this quite successfully. Believe me: this is not at all difficult and does not obligate [them] to anything; proof of this is, for example, the Brussels [newspaper] *Liberté*⁶⁷ which radicalized itself to the extent that it is not worth writing any more, while the editors continue to defend their position in unison, as before. The point is that *K.T.* and *Week* simply cannot afford to become strongly radical. (By the way, *Week* is kept alive almost exclusively by Ukrainophiles.) Take all of this into account, because otherwise your attitude appears completely childish.

5. It is difficult to say when the U.s.-d.p. arose, since it is a direct continuation of *khlopomania*. It is also difficult to estimate its strength. I think that on the average, in relation to the [Ukrainian] population it is slightly stronger than the party of the Great Russian radicals, but in any case not by very much. Whether it represents the expressed needs of the Ukrainian youth only a Muscovite boor [*moskovskii katsap*] could ask, because no one of another nationality, as far as I know, would even think of asking a similar question. Pose that question to Wróblewski, Marx, [Prosper Olivier] Lissagaray, Nikolič and others.⁶⁸ Propaganda work is progressing now more successfully than before, as is, in general, all socialist propaganda; consequently the organization is also stronger and serves as a reasonably good example of an *anarchist organization*.⁶⁹ Of course, this is all very, very relative.

6. In my opinion, one has to be a narrow nationalist not to recognize the right and the indispensability for each nationality to concern itself

⁶⁶ *Nedelia*, a political and literary newspaper published in Saint Petersburg from 1866 to 1901. In it Lavrov published his famous "Historical Letters" in 1868-9. In the 1870s it was an organ of the populists.

⁶⁷ *La Liberté*, an organ of the First International from 1865 to 1873.

⁶⁸ The participants of the London meeting to commemorate the twelfth anniversary of the Polish Insurrection of 1863. Smirnov was at the meeting, and *Vpered!* carried a report of the event in its 15 February 1875 issue.

⁶⁹ Underlined by Podolynsky. By "anarchist," Podolynsky wishes to stress the anti-centralist, federalist character of the organization.

with the well-known tasks in literature and culture. By that I mean [work on] the national language, the country's ethnography, the mores and customs, and also the truly indispensable textbooks. Without these things, i.e., without a dictionary, textbooks, and ethnographic knowledge of the people, etc., not only is the publication of revolutionary books and journals impossible, but even any meaningful oral propaganda. "Ukrainian intelligentsia" must be understood to mean [those] persons who are able and willing to undertake such activities. Unfortunately—no, rather, fortunately—for the Ukrainian people many of these persons are at the same time members of the U.s.-d.p.

7. The answer to your last question is almost identical to the answer to the sixth question. Namely, those tasks that for you, the Great Russians, are being accomplished or have already been completed by various institutions or by more or less liberal private individuals—to repeat the example, a dictionary, geographical-ethnographical research, etc.—and which are ready to be used by you in your revolutionary activities, both oral and written, we, regretfully, must somehow prepare ourselves. We have no one to rely on. There are few, if any, Ukrainophiles among the liberals, scholars, and so on. As I explained to you, they are either all authentic social democrats, or some of them, for appearance's sake, now only claim to be (probably only until the constitution, if there will ever be one). Therefore, part of this cultural and literary work is, of course, left to the Ukrainophile socialists as well. In addition, because a significant part of this work is carried out in direct contact with the people, for example, the census or the research of the geographical society,⁷⁰ this work also serves as preparation for purely revolutionary work and is far from being a complete loss.

As regards the importance of cultural-literary work and national forms in general, I advise you not to rely on your specifically Muscovite views, for they are deliberately mistaken on that [score], but to turn to the socialist representatives of as many nationalities as possible. By "your forms" I mean such things as the Great Russian language, examples from the life of the Great Russians, argumentation in the propaganda based on Great Russian customs, etc., things that, you will agree, are inappropriate for propaganda in Ukraine.

⁷⁰ The South-Western Section of the Russian Imperial Geographical Society was organized in Kiev in 1873 and became an instrument of the Ukrainophile Hromada for research and publication in Ukrainian studies. In 1874 it conducted a one-day census of Kiev; Podolynsky became a member of the society at the end of that year.

Journal

I hope that I have provided sufficiently detailed answers to all your questions. I still would like to write to you about some other things, but they can wait, as this letter has already turned out to be outrageously long.

Write back as soon as you can.

Yours, S. P[odolynsky]

I heard that Pereiaslavl'tseva died.⁷¹ If that is true, then write me in detail, if you can, about the last days of her life and about her death.

Give my regards to P[etr] L[avrovich Lavrov] and R[ozaliia] Kh[rystoforovna Idelson].

P.S. I ask you not to print anything anywhere about [the activities of] the Ukrainophiles, because that would be tantamount to pointing out [to the authorities] people who admit openly to being Ukrainophiles.

Translated by Roman Serbyn

⁷¹ The Typesetter for *Vpered!*

Пантелеймон Куліш

ЗАЗИВНИЙ ЛИСТ ДО УКРАЇНСЬКОЇ ІНТЕЛІГЕНЦІЇ

Пантелеймон Куліш (1819-97) — це видатна хоч контрoверсійна постать українського національного відродження. Друг і критик Шевченка, учасник Кирило-Методіївського Братства, історик і етнограф, автор першого українського роману "Чорна рада" та перекладач Біблії і Шекспіра, а при кінці свого життя — довголітній житель на хуторі. Це аспекти життя тієї самої людини, невиспущого "піонера з сокирою в руках". В історії української громадської думки Куліш відіграв ролі культурника, не державника. Він мав поважні сумніви щодо політичних аспірацій українців і твердив, що тільки творенням власної культури вони забезпечать собі своє існування. Огірчений забороною українських публікацій після 1876 р. в Росії, він виїхав в 1881 р. до Галичини, з якою мав добрі зв'язки. Тут, у Львові, власним коштом від видав дві збірки: "Крашанка русинам і полякам на Великдень 1882 р." і "Хуторна поезія". Першою із них він старався довести до українсько-польського порозуміння, в другій він опублікував 25 поезій і два есеї: "Історичне оповідання" (про 1847 рік) і "Зазивний лист до української інтелігенції". Обидві книжечки Куліша появились після того, як він рішився на нечуваний крок — своє зречення російського підданства. Хоч він відкликав пізніше свою заяву про зречення, Куліш хотів своїми галицькими публікаціями підняти спротив не тільки проти царату, але і проти деяких рідних стереотипів. "Зазивний лист", який тут передруковуємо в сторіччя його появи, і до сьогодні не затратив своєї актуальности.

Духа не угашайте.
Апостол Павел

Живий живе гадає.
Пословиця

Der freie Mensch denkt an nichts weniger als an den Tod, und freie Weisheit ist nicht ein Nachsinnen über das Sterben, sondern über das Leben. Man muss die Handlungen der Menschen weder beklagen noch belachen, sondern begreifen.

Spinoza *

* Вільна людина щонайменше думає про смерть, і вільна мудрість — це роздуми не про вмирання, а про життя. Дії людей не треба ні жаліти, ні висміювати, їх треба збагнути. Спіноза. (Ред.)

I.

Як панувала колись Польща, нашим предкам здавалось, ніби Русь від Карпат аж до Путивля єсть неділима часть Речі Посполитої польської, і нібито, не державшись із ляхом за руки, не можна русинові пробувати на світі.

Щиро прихилились наші предки до ляхів, щиро аж надто. Найповажніші доми в Червоній Русі, на Покутті, на Поділлі, на Волині і Білорусчині і по обидва боки Дніпра на Україні — нехтували навіть стару віру грецьку, щоб не різнитись ні в чім із польськими панами. Приподобляючись до приятелів ляхів, робились римськими католиками, кальвинцями, лютеранами, новохрещенцями, аріянами. Через приятельство з панами ляхами, руська інтелігенція сталась польською. Рідна мова великих предків пішла в неї у занедбання. Писали і розмовляли в поважних бесідах по-польськи, а хіба тільки лаялись по-руськи. Отак-то самохіть полячилась наша вельможна гоноровита Русь, позираючи чужим оком на шляхту нижчу, як і на всяку іншу руську дрібноту.

Тим часом русчина жила своїм природним життям у руському простолюдді і давала ознаку своєї самобутности незліченними піснями, що дивують етнографа своєю красою і силою. Та цвітучи собі і дико буяючи, не робила русчина прогресу, не робила через те, що не мала путі перед собою, ані чести й поваги за собою. У церковні школи її не прийнято; з церковної амбони нею не говорено; судове писарство її нехтувало; розмова про широку світову жизнь і політику її цуралась; друкована словесність нею погорджувала. Всюди панувала або мертва мова, котру вихохано штучно по старосвітських чернечих писарнях, або ж та польщизна, котру прийнято в нас між людьми поважними і для громадського життя і для розмови в рідних сім'ях.

Се ж усе сталося тим, що й наші руські пани і наші руські "владики", звичайно кривні тих же панів, не виробили просвіти в своїм народі і поривали очі на чужу. Над школою, над церковною амбоною, над судовою трибуною і над літературою царював той же пересуд що й над самим побутом руським. Варязька Русь так стерялась у татарському ярмі, а по татарах у перелюбках з Литвою та ляхвою, що їй здавалось, ніби тільки й світу, що в польському вікні.

Правда, що в польське вікно свobodно ринув світ гуманізму звідусіль, де його ще не пригашували давнішні просвітителі Європи. Та приплатилась наша Русь вельми дорого за те, що позирала на європейську культуру у чуже, а не в своє влас-

не вікно. Наслідком братання з панами-ляхами було те, що як розбуялась у польській Речі Посполитій соціальна уособиця під кінець XVI-го ст., — руське церковне поспільство зреклось єдиности з руською церковною аристократією, а під його ревним надихом занедбане культурниками поспільство мирське стало взивати ляхами не тільки руських латинців і прозелитів чесько-німецького нововірства, а і таких панів, що мурували йому церкви, споруджували монастирі, підпирали своєю повагою церковні братства і, держачись із дисидентами за руки, стояли на сеймах опіром проти політичної системи єдиности віри в Польщі.

Сим робом соціальні уособиці в Речі Посполитій польській прийняли зловіщу назву боротьби козаків із ляхами, дарма, що козаки боролись із вельможними представителями Руси, Острозькими, Вишневецькими, Сангушками, Четвертинськими, Корецькими і т. д. і т. д.

У сій погибельній для обох націй боротьбі, руських панів піддержали польські пани, а руських козаків — пани московські, думні люди царя Алексія Михайловича. І сим-то дивним судом збройної сили, древня, варягоруська аристократія втратила територію, котру осягла була правом оборони від хижого азійства. От як страшенно приплатились наші вельможні предки за те, що не вхопили своєї національної тропи, що не второпали єдиности своєї в рідних традиціях і в рідному слові з Руссю простолюдною.

II.

Занедбана своїми церковними і мирськими панами русчина залишила багато свого самоцвіту в польській словесності і прийнявши в себе доволі польщизни, перейшла під московське панування такою ж просторікою, якою була й під польським.

Після великої Руїни, що знівечила всю роботу європейської культури на обох берегах Дніпра, — під захистом міцної своєї суцільності Москви, по залюднених наново городищах і селищах постала так звана по-письменськи Мала Росія, а по-народному Україна.

Тут ізнов глибоко закоренилась і буйно проросла та самоцвітна мова, котру, за панування Польщі, не вважав за велику річ ніхто: ні королівська рада, ні панські сейми, ні схоластична тогочасна інтелігенція, як польська, так і наша руська. Розлилась вона далеко поза край України обох боків Дніпра, сягнула аж у Курщину і Вороніжчину, аж до Волги,

Дону, Кубані. І такий розлив просторікуватої, занедбаної високими властями і не запоможеної печатним словом русчини пророкував їй новий процвіт, нову красу і силу.

Справді, куди не заносилась наша весела або смутна пісня, наша поважна дума або жартівлива приспівка, всюди по великому руському світові слухано її з уподобою і переймано залюбки. У великих дуків царя Петра Первого, за трапезою дзвонили в кобзу і співали сліпі козаки, а при дворі цариці Анни Івановни в царському штаті знаходимо кобзаря українського. Тільки ж бо наші пани, що постали на Вкраїні з нових народних дуків, дбали не про те, як би рідну мову підняти до научної чи хоть громадянської поваги, а про те, як би приподобитись до своїх приятелів, панів московських.

Тоді ще було рано давати вагу такому ділу, як простолюдне слово, випечатане найкращою печаттю своєю по сільських піснях. Нащ тільки вік знає, чого вартий сей орган національного самоцуття. Так само, як за панування польського нехтувано рідною мовою задля мови приятелів ляхів, так само нехтувано нею вдруге задля мови московського панства, помазаного чужоземщиною. З ним бо наші пани своячилися і єдинилися; з ним у царській службі і в придворних церемоніях товаришували; до московських дуків, яко людей могучих, лестились; до їх моди і до їх звичаїв приспособлювались.

Через таку похіпливість, опадав укупі з пустоцвітом і найкращий цвіт нашого народу. Столична примана тягла до себе українських дуків, мовби яким магнетом. Коли б московське панство ходило не до "православної" церкви, а до католицького костьола чи до протестантського собору, не подивилась би наша аристократія на стародавні руські церкви свої, певно, ради нового добродія свого, москаля, сталась би чужовірною.

Сим робом насліддя незазваної старосвітчини, наша кохана мова, зосталась упослідженою вдруге. Держались бо в нас її по Вкраїні тільки знехтувані столицями доматори, люди малої науки, узенького кругозору, панки, підпанки, полупанки, міщани, козаки та посполита чернь, хлібороби. Уся ж інтелігенція, все що п'ялось на світові високості, усе багате, пишне, вельможне, усе освічене якою Бог послав наукою, — прихилились розумом і серцем до великорусчини.

Як бачимо, сталось із нами те ж саме під московським пануванням, що було під польським. Самохіть наші мирські і духовні пани, глави поспільства, зреклися рідної русчини своєї. Старі пересуди на користь мови господарньої і тогочасна бай-

дужість законів природи в житті нації робили те, що ніхто і не догадувався, який великий скарб лишали в простолюдній масі ті наші люди, що п'ялись на "російський Геликон" або поучали з церковної амбони рідних братів чужою мовою. Так само, як і в поєднанні з Польщею, нікому було в нас запровадити народну мову в школу, нікому звести на церковну амбону, нікому посадити її на судовій трибуні. Соромились розмовляти нею серед людей великосвітніх; погорджували тисячолітнім предківським словом у печатнях.

III.

Так наші восточні сусіди, самою перевагою власті, сили, достатку, позбавили нас, у свою чергу, національного верховіття і впослідили той елемент національної життя, котрий у людей наукових уважається за найперший. Не роблячи нам ніякого насильства, вони вичеркнули нас із книги живих націй, а давню нашу національну давнину присвоїли собі, яко річ, про котру, за нашим мовчанням, ніхто інший не озивався.

Були ми довго наче мертві, були нерухомі в летаргічному сні років із півторасти після того, як наш Богдан запродав нас разом у двоє рук, а його alter ego хотів запродати ще і в треті. Із свого летаргу пробудила нас рідна мова, як то правду сказав великий лях:

... dzwięk mowy rodzinnej mię osuci.*

По якомусь таємничому закону воскресіння завмерлих народностей, у Полтавщині, у Харківщині і, як бачимо, навіть у Чернігівщині, мов на тій кобзі струна до струни, озвались один по одному люди чужі й далекі між себе, і без лишніх орацій провозгласили нову націю між націями, в ім'я рідного слова і самостійного світогляду.

Велике се діло розпочав простодушно, без особливого задуму, Котляревський, і розпочав так радикально, мов соціальний реформатор. Постягував з Олімпу богів і богинь з полубогами, а з високих постаментів поспускав на долівку широ-кославних героїв, що можновладці брали собі за взір, і все те олімпійське та боготворене по великих містах панство повернув у мужицьку простоту. З уподобою прийняли письменні люди "перелицьовану Енеїду" величного Римлянина: бо побачили в ній своє поспільство, побачили хоч і з вивороту, та

* Неповний рядок із одного "Кримського сонета" Міцкевича. (Ред.)

все ж таки не сліпуючи так, як сліпували, захилившись за чужомовні книжки.

Сам Котляревський не знав добре, що він творить. Він покорявся несвідомому велінню народного духа; був тільки знаряддям українського світогляду. Чуючи ж по своїй поетичній природі, що сміхотворна "Енеїда" торкнула не всі струни в душі у земляків, змалював Котляревський життя народне ідилично в своїй опереті "Наталка Полтавка". Тут уже критика вбачає начерк літератури поважнішої.

Не хутко спроможеться яка б ні була початкова громада на змалювання себе писаним словом. Се бо вже висока стадія розумової культури. Нашим отцям здавалось порожньою забавкою те, що написав Котляревський. Умер він у своїй рідній Полтаві, а з ним наче загинула і його проба пера серед невпокою життя громадського. Отже з малої і одрубаної собі речі судилось народитись такому, що зрослося із нашою долею на віки, чого не мусимо забути, чого не занепасть ні панський егоїзм, ні государня політика: народилась українська література.

IV.

Література ся сталась демократньою не тільки по волі, а таки й по неволі. Появилась вона на Божий світ не до панської вподоби, а до вподоби і науки тих, котрі не бажають, щоб темні брати їм служили, а бажають самі темним братам послужити.

Прямуючи до такої мети робом великого Учителя, літературні робітники наші не щадили ні своїх сил, ні своїх достатків, аби посіяти серед народної темноти і бідноти таких проповідників науки, котрі, при нагоді, могли із приниженої до землі маси викликати до свого гурту природних, рукою Божою засіяних "чад премудрости", і вкупі з ними утворити націю самочутну, саморозуміючу, на своїй дорозі видющу, про свою будущину дбайливу.

Не шкодив сей великий задум нікому, опріч тих, що вважають мир за знаряддя свого егоїзму, опріч тих, що доп'явшись до високих титулів та великих гонорів, забезпечують долю свою діточкам своїм і діточкам діточок своїх яким би то ні було робом. Не те, що не шкодив нічому і нікому, а приспоровав великому руському світові велику будущину. Ним бо малося, на підмогу спільному добробутові, видвигнути з народної залежи животворню силу, котра тепер існує собі німуючи, сліпуючи, бідуючи або гайнуючи.

Отже знайшлися в Росії такі правителі, що позирали зкрива на етнографічну Україну, розпростерту широко серед руського світу, ніби вона своєю мовою робить якийсь перекир царському господарюванню. Стали сі люди, сі політичні homunculi, міркувати, яким би робом зупинити розцвіт української мови і привели царське правительство до неможливого діла — до угашення духа.

Тут починається нова повість про ізбієння младенців. . .

Було в Росії таке, що букварі і початкові шкільні книжечки дозволялось печатати по-жмудськи, по-самоїдськи, по-тунгузьки, тільки заборонено по-українськи.

Було таке, що збирати грошові жертви можна було на всяку учту і на всяку світову пустоту; постала тільки заборона українцям складатись хоч по вдовиній лепті на наукову запомогу землякам своїм.

Було таке, що не боронено видавати всякі газети і журнали людям порожнім, ради редакторської наживи з людського недосвіду і легкодумства; українським же народолюбцям заборонили сповіщати рідний край про все, чим би освітілась його темрява.

Було таке, що Боже слово перекладувалось і зирянською і комлицькою * мовою, тільки не вільно було перекладувати його мовою українською.

Постало нарешті уже й таке, що навіть у повістях, писаних великорусчиною, цензура поправляла и з б а т а м, де в рукописі стояло х а т а; вписувала б а р и н там, де автор писав п а н, і т. д.; а коли чумаки заспіває в автора:

”Против воли, против вози,
Против ярма і занози“,

то цензура вичеркувала чумацьке співання, яко українське.

V.

Як нам назвати ту безліч усяких мук, що в нас приймали мученики й мучениці за своє рідне слово? Чи то була римська неронівщина, чи іспанська торквемадівщина? Чи то була дальновидна правительствена мудрість, що знайде собі оправдання у віках грядущих; чи то була така необачність, що скритикує її й мала дитина?

Як її ні називаймо, а підлягати їй, мов безсловесні звірята, не мусимо. Бо коли ми дивуємось, як се наші предки так

* Очевидно Куліш мав на думці калмицьку мову. ”Комлики“ була загальновживана форма в 19 ст. (Ред.).

необачно збігли піною з кипучої української життя, то нехай же хоч нас наші потомки не докоряють марним шумуванням.

Тільки легкодухам здається, що наша сила ніщо супроти тієї сили, котра рине на нас із високостей государньої влади, мов яка Ніагара, грімлячи, крушачи, сліплючи і туманячи. Аж два царювання сплямовано вже гашенням нашого духа. І хіба ж його вгашено? Хіба ж ми злились в одну націю з "православним" Московським царством? Не тільки не злились, а стали від нього через те насильство ще далше, ніж були колись від Польського католицького королівства.

Через те насильство і тиранство ми тільки зрозуміли розумом і побачили очима, скільки ми втратили неоплатимої сили, піддобрюючись москалеві.

Ми вже не маємо своїх церковних ієрархів. Задля государньої московської політики, вони нас зрадили так само, як зрадили колись задля політики польської.

Не маємо вже і своїх сановників: бо й сі відбігли нас тим же робом, що й наші Острозькі, Вишневецькі і т. д.

Не маємо ні свого українського трибуналу, ні свого звичаєвого права.

Не маємо ні такої церкви, котра підлягала б суду громадської совісти, ні такої школи, котра виховувала б наших дітей згідно з духом нації.

Не маємо навіть рідної преси, котра б не давала національній мові миршавіти під впливом чужої і овіжала б духа народного серед нашого безголів'я.

Одне тільки наше зосталось при нас — живе українське слово. І тому задекретовано згинуті. Побалакають, мовляли, ще трохи сим жаргоном хлібороби, зійде він тільки на те, щоб розмовляти про вози, воли, ярма, пуги, налігачі і, не обперте ні об церкву, ні об школу і пресу, зникне собі, мов той недорід, що йому не судилося й на світі жити. . .

Отже воно не зникне вже через те саме, що його тиснуть і гонять. Наше слово загартоване в устах Олегів, Святославів, Володимирів, іще тоді, як Москва й не наклонулась. Загартували ми його і в устах того рицарства, до которого слалась із зазивами вся Європа, воюючи з ворогами віри Христової або свободи релігійної.

Тож воно служило в боротьбі сили мускульної з мускульною. Тепер наступив для нього час боротьби духа з духом. Як ні висліджують нас ті люди, що озиваються представителями Москви, а мусять признатись, що український дух виступив на своє діло життя героїчно.

Московське царство давно вже почало зватись всеросійським. Двадцять язиків за приводом Наполеона розбилось об його потугу. Історія його діяній стала печататись десятками томів, голосних, мов горласті гармати. Пишаючись перевагою над бойовими силами Сходу і Заходу, московський самодержець став зупиняти політичні бурі в Європі, мов той Нептун у Вергілія одним погуком: *Quos ego!* А московська мова обріла для себе такий невмирущий орган, як поет Пушкін. Велична зробилась Москва не однією стихійною силою. Здавалось би, нам подбало втонути у тому величчі, зникнути в блискавичному сяєві всеросійської слави, стопитись в один метал із Москвою серед страшеного огню, котрим вона налила землю і воду, перекуватись у щось неодмінне во віки під залізним ціпом тієї баби яги, що в нашій казці кує москалів на мідяному току, покрепляючи силу решетами картечі.

Москва виросла якимся дивом перед очима в Історії. Про нас, що допомогли їй знятись од землі аж під небо, ніхто й не згадував, прославляючи її царів та героїв. Нас мов би ніколи не було й на світі. . .

Аж ось, саме під ту велику годину, як засіяла повним світом невмируща слава Пушкіна, найкраща слава, якою може величатись нація, — у нас на Україні, серед забутих степових могил, мужицька мова піднялась із нечівля до високости всенародного жалю, плачу, піднялась до погорджування великою гординою і до погрожування великій потузі.

То правда, що в нових кобзарських співах було багатько буяння, як і в геройських подвигах тих варягів, що руйнували Болгарщину і Візантію, — як і в гайдамацькім завзятті тих козаків, що розбивали по Чорному морі християнське купецтво заодно з бусурманським, а дома пліндрували руські свої городи татарським робом. Тільки ж бо слов'янська інтелігенція не занедбала піснетворного генія через його недосвід. Широко від Петербурга до сербського Білграда, а від сербського Білграда до чеської Праги розлилась наша нова пісня, і навіть чужомовна Європа довідувала через переклади, у чому сила неторканих ще струн української кобзи.

Сила була в пророкуванні нової боротьби, боротьби за народне право вже не мечем і огнем, а духом і правдою. Заговорило понад Дніпром німе каміння: озвались голосно бур'януваті городища і все живе почуло, що гаряча предківська кров кипіла і бушувала не даремно.

Вхоплено й замчано кобзаря на край світу, між азійську дичу; придавлено його й примучено на тілі, ослаблено його й скалічено на душі; а голосна пісня його через те ще поголос-

нішала на широкому світі. Усе недодумане і недосвідоме з неї зчезло, зосталось тільки саме сяєво.

Так у великих проповідників людської віри, чи вони сходили з громохмарної гори у юдоль повсякденщини, чи з'являлись посеред степової рівняви з блискучими своїми снами і таємничими призовами, никне марою те, чим вони рівня приземкуватим людям, і сяє невгасимим во віки світлом те, чим вони вищі над похилу до землі людську природу. Так насліддя предківської слави чиститься в непроглядних століттях, мов у водах мовчазної Лети, і зостається нам від неї саме героїство духа, що підіймає серце на благодатні задуми і на великі подвиги.

VI.

Отсеж не сумуймо про мізерну долю нашого українського народу; не журимось про те сирітство, у якому зоставсь і зостається він без первоцвіту свого громадянства і своєї древньої церкви. Знаючи з історичного досвіду, як уставали нації, повержені незгодою, або дикою силою в прах, уповаймо духом бодрим, що в нашій давнині затаїлася сила невмируща і що ми тією силою дійдемо колись до того зросту, який сама природа нам на роду написала.

Не загине те слово, що дало животворящу запомогу аж двом літературам. Велике воно по своїй природі; а велике слово свідкує про величчя того народу, що зачав його в глибині свого духу.

Так, ми не малий нарід, дарма, що нас не добачають наші сусіди у своїм величанні. Не малий уже тим, що докіль стояли ми за Польщу, під п'ятою ляха ізвивалась Москва; а як почали стояти за Москву, стала тоді Польща пищати під п'ятою в Москви.

Не малий і тим, що давши Польщі і Москві архирейів, вельмож і писателів, не пошились ми в чужоземщину слідом за своїми спокушеними главами.

Найбільше ж величчя української нації явне з того, що зоставшись без церковного, політичного, воїнського і наукового передовництва, спромоглась вона видати з себе самобутню літературу і затривожила не помалу силоміцних єдинителів Руси.

Пам'ятне бо нам слово московського оракула *: що польське повстання єсть ніщо, як порівняти його з повстанням лі-

* Михайл Катков (1818—1887), видатний російський публіцист.

тературної України. Там, рече, відпала б, може, під лихий час, невеличка провінція від Імперії; а тут мужицька мова, ставши літературною, розколола Імперію на самій серцевині. Так промовила, віщуючи про нас, московська піфія, і се нам не малий прогностик, що ми, літературною пропагандою, утворимо собі, скоро чи нескоро, таку церковну ієрархію, котра величатиметься чимсь кращим, ніж цяцьковані митри, і таке вельможество, котре пишатиметься чимсь достойнішим, ніж предківське надбання, і таку інтелігенцію, котра буде розумна малочисним людям, як батьки і матіркі розумні дітям своїм.

Благодатна земля, що зродила вже стільки багатого жнива, лежить облогом перед нами. Зачаровано сей обліг іще тоді, як боролись наші руські козаки з нашими руськими панами, зачаровано й заклято: щоб на сьому облозі поламався усякий плуг, котри не сам нарід-абориген собі викує.

VII.

Отсеж почали ми його кувати, сього чудовного плуга, з того часу, як постягали богів з Олімпа, а полубогів із мраморних постаментів, та поробили громадянами. Дарма, що нас так тяжко тіснять і пригнічують необачні государники. Ми і в тісноті і пригнеті куємо та куємо собі словесні лемеші та чересла помалу. І прийде той час, що пихатимемо предківське займище без цензурного дозволу.

А щоб роса не вибивала нам очей, поки зійде наше сонце, сонце духовної свободи, — треба нам, браття земляки, заложити літературний кіш у безпечному високою цивілізацією місті.

Шкода нам звати москаля дядьком. Дякуючи нам і за оружжя і за моральну підмогу, він хоче загладити наше обличчя серед народів: хоче, щоб ми забули, хто ми і яке наше національне право, хоче, щоб ми не мали ні пуття, ні чести, ні поваги на світі.

Отсеж, проповідуючи істину, яко істочник свободи, мусимо ходити робом тих, котрим великий Учитель роду людського наказав: що коли гнатимуть їх в одному місці, нехай утікають до другого. Певно ж бо знайдеться в культурному світі притулок, звідкіля у всю руську землю ізійде віщання наше, на пробуд сонних і на воскресіння мертвих.

Розпочинаю се спасенне діло книжкою, котру назвав "Хуторною поезією" на ознаку того, що коли б ні в однім городі, ні в однім селі не знайшлося уже живого зерна до засіву

національної ниви, то рука Божа знайде ще його в хуторах і широко позасіває навіть і жидівське поле на Вкраїні, не тільки те, що підлягає нашим перевертням.

VIII.

Виставимо, миле браття, на високостях науки і літератури наше національне знамено. Не побачить на ньому плями ні один край, окрім хіба тієї Московщини, що слухає цькування своїх погибельних політиків, своїх сліпих книжників і фарисеїв. Чистий стоятиме сей стяг у сяєві гуманітарності. Не стягує він людей на криваве діло, на гарбання чужої предківщини, на топтання під ноги чужої святині. Стягує він українську розпуджену сім'ю до наслідування предківського надбання — рідного слова, до наслідування правом науки і словесности.

Сим не зупиняймося, миле браття, що таке велике передвзяття розпочинаємо малими силами. Усе велике на землі стало з малого, і все потужне з малосильного. Не зупиняймося моральним занепадом наших українців.

Понурились вони тепер у землю німуючи, мов ті воли під'яремні. Прийде ж той час, що вони випростаються, і з "німого язика" зробляться віщателями національної правди. Перелічать вони себе всюди: і на рідній і на чужій землі, і по селах і по городах, і по степах і по морях. Прокинуться і в столиці, що стоїть на людських кістках, викована з самого заліза. Відгукнеться ними й страшений Сибір, перемірний нашими ногами. Заб'ється українське серце навіть і в іншого перевертня, мов у того "Ляха Потурнака, клюшника галерського, недовірка християнського". Плодюща наша полуденно-руська земля. Насищала вона своїми дітьми двоє великих царств, та ще й тепер інші з них живі в чужоюдній утробі, мов той пророк у символічному китовім череві. Звергне їх чужа національність, на проповідь рідної української.

До гурту ж, небожата, і великі й малі! До гурту, паненята з мужичатами! До гурту рятувати святе насліддя — слово! Воно бо скарбівня нашого духа. Воно — великий завіт незнанної нашої предківщини. Воно — правдиве пророкування нашої будущини.

Мусим, любі земляки, заходитись укупі всі живі коло живої праці, що залочали наші предки варяги й козаки. Вони робили своє національне діло, буяючи, як люди віку темного; а ми робитимем своє розмишляючи, як люди освічені наукою; вони — мечем та кулаччям, а ми — пером та лагодою.

Нехай царі царюють, а великі пани панують. Общі причини привели їх до страшної переваги; общі причини вкажуть і розумну міру їх перевазі. Не хитаймо високих стольців: не зневажаймо і великих заслуг давніх государників. Нехай старий завіт історії стоїть перед нами в своїй повазі. Новий виробить і нове вино, і нові міхи по винотоках.

ІХ.

От на таких-то основинах треба нам працювати в тих благословенних землях, де над мислячою головою не стоїть із довбнею безголовий цензор і за плечима в проповідника Христової свободи не притаївся порабителъ кат.

Усе те зле й лихе, що заподіяла нам колись нещаслива Ляхва, а тепер останніми часами необачна Москва, сталось через політичну темряву, через те, що політика не питала дороги в науки, а наука не обпиралась на єдину філософію, достойну свого імени, на філософію природовідання. Дійшовши, з прогресом кругосвітньої наукової праці тієї правди, що безкрай і безмірний космос у величезних і найменших творивах Божих дає нам закон громадянського життя і розумового прямування, кладемо її в основину нашого проповідання української національності і духовної свободи. Закинене серед чужої нам громадянщини, серед чужоплемінного і чужоядного натовпу, слово наше ховалось тільки по невмирущих піснях та в тайниках наших сімей, — у тайниках, недоступних політичній інспекції. Викликаємо його тепер з останнього сховища на ширшу просторінь. Досі перепроваджено його в нас тільки через віковічні книги Святого Письма. Наступила черга перепровадити його через поетичні твори великих народів і через філософічну, оберту на природовідання науку.

Який ні єсть малий собі спочатку наш видавничий захід, як ні трудно робити на одшибі то діло, котре народи свободні роблять у себе дома; та не маючи іншого способу проповідання нашої загнаної і забитої правди, мусимо вважати своє видавництво — не з гордоців, а з гіркого жалю — і за народну школу, котру нам заборонено дома, і за церковну амбону, котрої наше духовенство нам не соблюло і не вповажнито.

Спогадаймо, браття, про ту годину бідолашню, як під колотнечу за "духовні хліби" замикали і пустошили церкви по руських наших городах не тільки іновірці, а й самі ті, що називались "благочестивими" владиками. Занедбане, а часом і розпуджене поспільство виходило тоді в поле і під чистим не-

бом слухало церковної науки, на яку спромагались убогі і гонимі благовістувателі. Ми живемо під однаковим гонительством. Коли ж спасенні душі, у своїй науковій темноті, переховали свято віру предків своїх, як тоді найкраще можна було її зрозуміти, то маючи в руках такі могутні знаряддя до проповідання істини, як наука і література, ми тим паче можемо переховати предківський завіт національної свободи і свободної совісти.

Нехай же наша сила в нашій немоці совершається. Нехай з нашого серця рине та велика потуга, що нашим польовим благовістувателям не дала підклонитись під замикачелів і пустошителів святих церков. Коли завзяті люди меча і полум'я були нашими предками по кипучій крові, то безбоязнені люди Христової правди — сіль української землі, тихий світ народу українського, герої християнської любови і самоотверження — були нашими правдивими предками по невгасимому духові.

Пам'ятаймо, рідне браття, апостольське слово, що поставили ми девізом до сього Зазивного Листа: Духа не угашайте! Не гасімо його самі по собі; тоді ніхто його не вгасить і в нашому народові. Нехай наших гасителів поб'є всьогосвітній сором, а наше знамено нехай сіяє своєю чистотою і правотою на віки.

Гірка і мов уже безвихідна наша доля, що й казати!... Споглянувши, який страшенний розплодився на Вкраїні тиск чужомовного, нам ворожого панства, яке зрадливе сидить у нас на апостольських сідалищах архиєрейство і як починовничено в нас навіть людей науки; споглянувши на ту жмінку людей, котрих можна у нас назвати оком, ухом і серцем України, тільки зітхнеш, промовивши з Шевченком:

”Обідрана сиротою
Понад Дніпром плаче...
Тяжко, важко сиротині,
А ніхто не бачить, —
Тільки ворог, що сміється“.

Та нема такої безодні, з котрої б не викарабкалась нація моральною перевагою над стихійною силою, над силою незапрацьованого чесно багатства і над силою влади, не оправданої філософією природи.

Покищо втішатимемось хоч тим, що чуємо в собі доволі снаги на протест перед всьогосвітньою інтелігенцією за сліпе і тиранське вбивання нашого національного духа.

Myroslav Shkandrij

FICTION BY FORMULA: THE WORKER IN EARLY SOVIET UKRAINIAN PROSE

The year 1927, the tenth anniversary of the Revolution, was in several ways a turning point for Ukrainian literature. It saw the climax of the great "Literary Discussion," the polarization of writers into two opposing camps (VAPLITE—the Free Academy of Proletarian Literature—and VUSPP—the All-Ukrainian Union of Proletarian Writers), and the clash of two conflicting theories of literature and of two concepts of cultural development.

Each of the two parties attempted to produce a literature that accorded with its aesthetic, cultural and political theories, and it was during this year that VUSPP, the eventual winner in the struggle and the group sponsored by the Communist Party, began to produce examples of what it considered models for Ukrainian literature to emulate. Today these works are considered examples of "heroic" or "socialist" realism; they are presented in Soviet textbooks as the first examples of that literature which is vigorous and edifying and constitutes the mainstream. They are also the first attempts at portraying the Soviet Ukrainian worker, the "new man" of Soviet society, its "positive hero."

Until this point there had been almost no attempts at portraying the Ukrainian working class in Soviet fiction, and the few that had been made were very unsatisfactory from the Party's point of view, as Soviet literary histories readily admit.¹ It is instructive, therefore, to examine the much-acclaimed first literary products of VUSPP and the kind of image of the working class that was deemed "useful" and "understandable to the proletariat," an "aid to the creation of steady ideological positions" and to the organization of emotions."² Such an examination is all the more interesting

¹ See, for example, *Istoriia ukrainskoi literatury*, 8 vols. (Kiev, 1970), 6: 306.

² From comments by V. Zatonsky, the Party's representative at the VUSPP founding conference in January 1927. See "Vseukrainskyi zizd proletarskykh pysmennykiv," *Komunist*, 26 January 1927.

in the light of the debate that took place in the Soviet press in the early 1970s, which pointed out that the image of the worker presented in this fiction and in the construction novel of the 1930s was a myth.³ It became, however, an image that persisted, a stereotype from which contemporary Soviet literature is still trying to free itself.

This paper contends that all the works produced in 1927 and 1928, and since canonized, conform to certain conventions, that they are, in fact, written after a certain formula. Those that deviate from this formula are precisely the ones that have not been republished; they are passed over in silence or are criticized for these very deviations. The following works are usually listed as the cornerstones of the new literature about the working class: Ivan Mykytenko's *Braty* (Brothers, 1927); Petro Panch's *Povist nashykh dniv* (A Story of Our Time, 1928); Leonid Smiliansky's *Novi oseli* (New Settlements, 1928); Leonid Pervomaisky's *Pliamy na sontsi* (Sun Spots, 1928); Ivan Le's *Roman mizhhiria* (A Novel of the Lowlands, 1929). To these are usually added works such as Ivan Kyrilenko's *Kursy* (Courses, 1927) and Oles Dosvitnii's *Khto?* (Who?, 1927), which follow the formula but are indirectly concerned with the Ukrainian working class.

A brief glance at the reprintings of these books will show the enormous weight they carry in the history of official Soviet Ukrainian literature. *Braty* was republished twice in 1928 (over 37,000 copies), in 1930 (25,000), in 1931 (20,000), in 1932 (50,000) and at regular intervals since; *Povist nashykh dniv* in 1929 (20,180), 1930 (40,000) and regularly since; *Novi oseli* in 1930 (20,000) and regularly since; *Roman mizhhiria* twice in 1930 (40,000 and 10,000), twice in 1931 (15,000 and 25,000), twice in 1932 (25,000 and 10,000), in 1934 (30,000) and at regular intervals since; *Kursy* in 1930 (10,000), in 1932 (20,000) and regularly since. The other two books mentioned, Pervomaisky's *Pliamy na sontsi* and Dosvitnii's *Khto?* were initially given small reprintings but have since then been ignored. (*Pliamy na sontsi* was even dropped from Pervomaisky's *Tvory v semy tomakh* [Kiev, 1968-70], which contained most of his works.) The reason for this, as we shall see, is because they broke the conventions.

³ The debate was carried in *Voprosy literatury*, 1970, nos. 6 and 10; 1971, nos. 1 and 3. See also A. Ianov, "Rabochaia tema," *Novyi mir*, 1971, no. 3, pp. 239-65; "Dvizhenie molodogo geroia," *Novyi mir*, 1972, no. 2, pp. 232-61; V. Kantorovich, "Zavod i liudi," *Novyi mir*, no. 6, pp. 224-46. For the analogous debate in Ukrainian literature, see M. Lohvynenko, "Heroi literatury—trudivnyk," *Vitchyzna*, 1971, no. 3, pp. 149-56.

The basic structure of all these works is remarkably similar. A strong individual who has proven his worth is sent by the Party into a situation of disorganization and demoralization. The masses, who are divided among themselves and unable to see clearly what has to be done, have to be convinced of the merit of the project or plan of the farsighted leader. At first they are sceptical and resist. Usually they are also the victims of their own backward ideas or of subversive agents working in their midst. Eventually, however, the personal qualities of the man with a "Bolshevik schooling" and the correctness of his plans win the masses over, and the sceptics and hostile elements are defeated. Generally the hero is strong, silent, morose and mysterious. He often comes trailing clouds of glory: a heroic revolutionary past (Svyr in *Povist nashykh dnyv*, Pavlo Sirchenko in *Kursy*, Nero in *Khto?*). The workers, or "masses," are portrayed as amorphous raw material, lacking confidence in their own abilities, and incapable of taking initiatives. In Panch's story Svyr arrives from nowhere and gets the workers to rebuild a glass factory and start up production; in Kyrylenko's *Kursy* a young Party activist starts secondary education for proletarian youth by organizing a new school; in Ivan Le's *Roman mizhhiria* the hero arrives with an irrigation and electrification project for Uzbekistan.

The passivity and resistance of the masses is taken for granted: they are backward, generally hostile, and suspicious. Often the behaviour of the hero is imperious, at the very least patriarchal. He speaks in the tone of a strict father, often abruptly, condescendingly, and threateningly. He does not arrive at a developed understanding of the project through discussion and cooperation with the workers; it springs ready-made from his brain, and the story's interest is in breaking down opposition to it.

The masses are portrayed as docile and dull-witted but capable of great endurance. The proletarian youth in *Kursy* sit around in their dormitory freezing during the cold winter, occasionally organizing physical exercises to keep warm, until Pavlo Sirchenko comes along and tells them to break up an old wooden gate for firewood.

The hero possesses one great quality: his single-minded determination. Whereas the masses lack discipline and often treat his plans with amused cynicism, the hero burns with a passionate faith in his goal. He subordinates everything, including his personal life, to achieving the goal. Sexual relations either play no part in the hero's life (Svyr, Nero, Nykanor and Prokhor in *Braty*), or are consciously rejected in favour of the project under construction. Pavlo and Varia in *Kursy* decide not to have an affair, but instead

to "grit their teeth and find forgetfulness in work." At the end of Smiliansky's *Novi oseli*, the hero, Kucheriavy, knows that his wife is running away with an unscrupulous engineer who has "turned her head." Instead of going to the train in which she is about to depart with her lover, however, he calmly stops and makes his way to the building site where he is working as a painter in order to check whether the caretaker is doing his job. Having reached the site, he lies on the grass with another worker and watches the train leave.

In one passage in Panch's *Povist nashykh dniv* the sexual sublimation is explicit: a worker walks over to the newly acquired glistening machines and describes them as beautiful women while lovingly touching their smooth surfaces.

Each of the stories is built around one structural turning point. This comes when the resistance of the masses is overcome and they willingly embrace the hero's and Party's point of view. It could be the resistance of an old worker who considers himself too old to change his ideas, the hostility of a peasant who has no faith in the city, the capitulation of a bandit in the forests, or the acceptance of new customs by an old culture bound by religious beliefs. In each case, however, it is clear that the hero wishes to harness the undisciplined, elemental force that has thus far escaped his control. In Kyrylenko's *Kursy* the metaphor for this undisciplined working class is Kubanets the bandit. He is described as a captured wild animal that has difficulty becoming acclimatized to the city:

He entered quickly—sombre, tied up with a belt, flashing his jet-black eyes. He was not accustomed to sitting in one place; the silent rooms of the Cheka, where everyone knew their place and a stringent, unbreakable discipline reigned, irritated him. The city with its grey, stone buildings lay upon him with a great weight. He yearned for the steppe, the wooded valleys, freedom. But . . . the regular detachment was stationed in the city . . . and Kubanets sensed this perfectly well.

When resistance to the hero's or the Party's point of view is overcome, it results in a flood of feeling and the establishment of a powerful emotional bond. In *Kursy* the old music teacher sobs tears of gratitude when he is allowed to work again: "At first . . . I thought that they were all . . . barbarians . . . They are really people after all." Broken and penitent, he is accepted into the fold and organizes exemplary concerts. A similar flood of emotion overcomes the peasant brother, Nykanor, in Mykytenko's story when

he finally sees that the workers in the city are the allies of the peasantry and not its enemies.

This moment is the focal point of the story; it symbolizes the triumph of the hero's point of view and the submission to his will of the masses, who fully repent their stubbornness. One cannot help sensing a deep-rooted fear of the spontaneity of the masses in these stories, a suspicion of their desire for self-organization. Although Soviet critics fiercely deny this, claiming instead that the real hero in these works is often the collective, the working class as a whole, a careful reading reveals the opposite: the stories are written to demonstrate the indispensability of the leader and the Party.

This point comes across particularly forcefully in Dosvitnii's *Khto?*, a novel set in New York and Paris in the period from 1905 to October 1917 and focussing on discussions within the workers' movement between anarchists, anarcho-syndicalists, social democrats, and revolutionaries. Such a setting allows the émigré Ukrainian worker to make observations about the socialist movement in the West, especially about the all-important question of the relationship of the leadership to the masses. "Without ten talented . . . tested, professionally prepared leaders who have gone through a long schooling, who understand one another perfectly, no class can carry on a firm struggle in the contemporary society," says one character in the novel. The opposite point of view is presented by the anarchist, Lia, who objects that in every hierarchical organization the "bureaucratic scorpion" eventually rises to the top. When the organization begins to grow, she argues, the careerist and power monger takes over and "the control and direction by the masses becomes more and more of an illusion. In the course of things the government official, as a rule, rises to the position of chief or leader and decides the vital interests of the organization, union, or party without consulting the masses at all."⁴ In the end, however, Lia is made to accept the former view; as she realizes the ineffectiveness of trade unions and the corruption of workers' representatives, she becomes convinced that it is not the "millions of sickly worms" who decide the fate of history, but the "tens or hundreds of strong, flinty individuals."⁵

The reader, of course, is expected to draw the conclusion that the Bolshevik model of organization is the only viable one and that the model of the October Revolution has to be adhered to

⁴ O. Dosvitnii, *Khto? Sotsiialnyi roman* (Kiev, 1927), p. 111.

⁵ Ibid., p. 170.

faithfully by the entire workers' movement. Here the leader-masses formula is extended to signify the relationship of the Bolshevik Party to the international workers' movement.

Dosvitnii's novel illustrates several other conventions quite well. First, the Western workers are portrayed as inferior to the Russian and Ukrainian ones: they are more timid, less willing to grasp the radical solution, and more easily swayed by temporary reforms. The American workers are seen as a malleable force that is easily manipulated by the bosses and resists being welded into a militant organization. Nero, the strongman of militancy who idolizes Lenin, describes the American workers as "morons" and their socialist leaders as "Khlestiakovs."⁶ As for the French working class, it is fond, we are told, of revolutionary phraseology, but incapable of genuine activity. Both working classes, it is suggested, ought to learn from the steadfastness and clearheadedness of the workers in the Russian Empire, who rejected the false perspectives offered by trade-union activity and parliamentary struggles. As Nero puts it in a letter to his Ukrainian comrade in America: "when your leader has a rotten head (as all your American ones do by nature), nothing good will come of things, and the entire IWW is not worth a thing."⁷

A second convention presented is that the American and French workers are gullible and far too trusting of their leaders, who are either cowardly and spineless reformists or opportunists intent on making careers for themselves as parliamentary ministers. Toward the end of the book it transpires that reactionary foreign governments (Russia and Austria) fund and control American unions.

The third convention is that the light is appearing in the East, with the coming of the October Revolution. The very best of the revolutionaries in the West (Lia, Leo, Nero, Oids) either drop everything and leave immediately for Russia or begin organizing demonstrations in the West in defence of the revolution. The question in the title of the book, *Khto?*, asks: who will make the revolution? The answer is: the Bolsheviks, Russia.

An interesting variation of this leader-led, Party-masses juxtaposition, which constitutes the main structural feature of these stories, emerges in the treatment of the non-Russian nationalities within the Soviet Union. For example, in Ivan Le's *Roman mizhhiria* the influence of Russian civilization on Uzb-

⁶ Ibid., pp. 38, 52.

⁷ Ibid., p. 106.

kistan and the influx of Russian specialists into that country is defended as a historically progressive phenomenon. Moreover, even the conquest of the territory by Russian imperial generals is justified in the name of progress. In the following passage, the hero, Said-Ali, contemplates the fact that a railway station has been named after a Russian general, Skobelev:

What the hell do we need this general for? . . . Skobelev obediently carried out the policy of conquest of the tsarist government of Russia, he subdued the country, as they used to call it. No one can deny that this subjugation was not free of the clearly colonialist policy of tsarism. But can we forget that in those times, for many peoples in those historical conditions the danger of their subjection to Western colonizers, through the arms of Turkey or Persia, was growing? Of course General Skobelev did not have the best interests of the people of Uzbekistan at heart. But we'll let the historians deal with that question⁸

If we now turn to those books that have not been republished since the early 1930s, in particular Pervomaisky's *Pliamy na sontsi* and Dosvitnii's *Khto?*, it becomes evident why they are not viewed favourably by the authorities. Instead of reassuring the reader that the Party is doing a good job and that everything is well under control, they dwell upon the difficulties, failures, and inadequacies of the Party. The conclusions of these books fail to resolve all these problems neatly, allowing loose threads to be left hanging instead. From the point of view of the ideal scheme described above, this is quite unsatisfactory. In the first place, the hero fails to dominate events completely, to stamp his indelible mark upon them, and to convey all popular forces into the desired channels. Secondly, the masses are shown to be divorced from the Party and resisting the Party's advances even at the end of the story. This is a cardinal fault from the point of view of the formula and, hence, makes these works less than perfect models. Furthermore, both books portray life as something irreducible, unforeseeable, something that escapes the grasp of the most sensitive and intelligent individual or Party. Not only are the criticisms of the Party in these books very outspoken and the negative characters quite convincing—therefore throwing a wrench into the tidy right-wrong equation that the formula requires—but there is a yearning in these works for something over

⁸ Ivan Le, *Tvory v semy tomakh* (Kiev, 1969), 2: 69-70. The 1929 edition of the novel was unavailable to the author of this article.

and above the short-term goals set by the Party, for the unsolvable philosophical questions, the eternal imponderable truths. In Pervomaisky it is the theme of death, of the meaning of an individual's life; in Dosvitnii it is the sweep of human history and concern for the place of small nations and small groups within it. For the above reasons, although these two works are mentioned with some pride by Soviet historians as quality literature, they are never republished and never included in the lists of exemplars that are regularly recited at literary congresses as the genealogy of socialist realism, the classics that young writers ought to learn from.

Pervomaisky allows himself to break the conventions in several ways: by having one character make an unfavourable comparison with the West, by letting another suggest that hunger and misery will always be with us, by showing what an unmitigated disaster workers' safety is, by suggesting that the relationship of the Komsomol to the workers is condescending and secretive, and by revealing that the communist youth are not supermen, but confused, ordinary people who spend most of their time on rather insignificant everyday problems at the workplace.

In some ways Pervomaisky's book answers those of Panch, Mykytenko, Kyrylenko, and other formula writers. He clearly places the safety of workers above production—which the others do not; he shows sympathy for the downtrodden little person and minorities such as Jews, women, Trotskyists—which the other writers ignore, treating the working class as an undifferentiated, amorphous mass; and he readily admits failures and problems. However, on the key question of the basic plot structure, the relationship of the leader to the led, the Party to the masses, the novel comes close enough to the norm to admit it into the fold, albeit with some reservations: in *Plamy na sontsi* the Komsomol and the Party can collectively be considered the "positive hero," even though they emerge at the end of the book with a tarnished image.

It is clear that Pervomaisky was resisting the stylization of literature in progress at the time, its reduction to a formula, to a set of rigid conventions. Because of his book's deviations from these emerging norms, it was dropped from the list of exemplary works when socialist realism was institutionalized between 1932 and 1934 and the formula for writing became more prescriptive. In 1927, it has to be remembered, there still were competing literary theories and examples of different literary practice.

The binary apposition between the leader and the led, the Party and the masses, the progressive nation and the more back-

ward one, is paralleled by a fundamental apposition between "consciousness" and "spontaneity." "Consciousness" here stands for the activity of politically informed, disciplined, and organized forces, while "spontaneity" represents uncoordinated, unconscious, or anarchic forces that may be extremely powerful and behave with a blind, elemental rage. As critics have already pointed out, this apposition between "consciousness" and "spontaneity" has deep roots in the Marxist-Leninist view of history as man's progress from being a victim of historical forces to their controller. It is also at the heart of the Leninist doctrine of the "vanguard," which split the Russian Social Democrats into Bolsheviks and Mensheviks. Lenin, it will be remembered, contended that one could make a revolution in a country such as Russia, where the classic Marxist conditions for one did not exist, by forging a small group of highly conscious revolutionaries who could first raise the consciousness of the masses and then guide them to a revolutionary upheaval.⁹

Thus, the working out of the "consciousness/spontaneity" dialectic in the Soviet novel could be seen as a parable of the Marxist-Leninist view of history, leading to a final resolution of conflicts analogous to the establishment of a classless, communist society.

It has also been suggested that such a scheme has much in common with the lives of the saints, that it is a "road to consciousness" parable, or a sort of Soviet *Bildungsroman*, in which the hero, after many trials and tribulations, reaches a state of grace.¹⁰

These views help us to understand why "spontaneity" (the Ukrainian word is *stykhiiist*, which, besides the idea of spontaneous, uncoordinated activity, also carries the meaning of a blind, elemental force) was viewed with such disfavour after about 1927. Before then, the revolution was often described as a flood, a gale, or a fire, and *stykhiiist* was not seen as necessarily a bad thing as long as its power could be channelled in the right direction. After this date, however, its glorification became a dangerous, even subversive act, and novels that contained a larger dose of *stykhiiist* than "consciousness" (*svidomist*) were banned. The classic cases are Valeriiian Pidmohylny's *Tretia revoliutsiia* (The Third Revolution), which showed the peasants' hostility to the town, and Iurii Ianovsky's *Chotyry shabli* (Four Sabres), which

⁹ For a discussion of the "spontaneity/consciousness" dialectic see K. Clark, *The Soviet Novel: History as Ritual* (Chicago, 1981), pp. 15-24.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 48-56.

glorified the peasant rebellions during the revolution. Both books are mentioned today in strictly negative terms in Soviet literary histories.

Stykhiinist could also refer to the beast within one; hence, "excessive" delving into psychology was frowned upon. Moreover, the Soviet critics developed a theory of personality that refused to admit that the psyche was a battleground of conflicting forces; instead they insisted on the "positive hero" being calm, composed, stern, and very deliberate in his actions. Such writers as Volodymyr Vynnychenko, Mykola Khvylovy, Valeriian Pidmohylny, and Borys Antonenko-Davydovych, who delved into the psychological traumas of their characters, were therefore severely reprimanded at this time for such investigations, and the offending works were banned.

The analysis of the formula could be developed by examining its other aspects. We will very briefly mention three of them: the complication, the setting, and the point of view.

Since the complication cannot be an internal problem of the hero or of the working class itself, which, the formula demands, must be portrayed as a force for progress and for good, it usually becomes an external factor: the scheming of counterrevolutionary elements that have not reconciled themselves to the new life. They are not of working-class origin, but are the children of the petite bourgeoisie. The literary topoi of their description are a mincing way of speaking, a dislike for physical labour, and a penchant for fine clothes and perfumes. It is these characters that produced the complication that prevents the hero and the working class from establishing an understanding sooner than they do. The negative characters are usually in league with bandits in the woods (in *Kursy*) or with foreign spies and agitators (British agents from Persia in *Roman mizhhiria*). Their exposure and defeat often constitutes a subplot, an additional obstacle to be overcome on the path separating the hero and the masses.

The setting is generally a new environment for the hero; it could be a foreign land, a new and unfamiliar task, a transformed situation, or hostile surroundings. In Panch's story it is the factory and the need to understand the workings of new machinery; in Kyrylenko's *Kursy* it is the unfamiliar role of school organizer; in Le's *Roman mizhhiria* it is the hostile environment of backward, Islamic Uzbekistan. Sometimes, as in the last book, it could be a setting to which the hero returns after a long absence. In all cases, however, the hero is an outsider, and in all cases the key to success lies in his bringing the collective of workers over to his side. Invariably he succeeds in introducing his "higher," more

advanced "consciousness" into the situation and in making this consciousness dominate and defeat the more backward, local one.

The point of view in these stories, as might be expected, is always that of the hero. Although the events are described through a seemingly conventional third-person narrative, the narrator sees the world through the hero's emotions and quite often slips into the latter's tone of voice. Any forms of detachment from the events described or from the hero's point of view, such as irony, parody, or even a sense of humour, are quite foreign to the narrator in these stories. Only in Pervomaisky's *Pliamy na sontsi* does the narrator occasionally drift into the point of view of the older workers who view the aggressive, self-confident Komsomol youth with tolerant scepticism, and this proves devastating for the formula, threatening at times to subvert the entire Party-masses relationship that the code demands.

An examination of other kinds of formula writing, such as hagiography, detective stories, serial novels, and Harlequin romances, provides useful insights into the formulaic qualities of Soviet fiction, especially of its canonical exemplars. If we make a brief comparison of the essential structure of Ukrainian fiction already described with, for example, Harlequin romances, the formula emerges even more clearly.

Harlequin romances, like the fiction of the VUSPP writers in Ukraine in the late 1920s, are a collection of similar but not identical stories containing certain conventions. All these conventions are not necessarily present in any given story, but they constitute a kind of pool from which the author is free to draw. More importantly, however, they have the same fundamental structure, and it is this deeper structure that provides the reassuring sameness that the reader is looking for or expected to look for.

The plot of a Harlequin romance can be divided into three parts, three different consciousness structures: the preconscious romance, the realization of love, and the conscious romance. In most of the narratives there is an important dividing line, which is the moment when the heroine becomes aware of her love for the hero.

The scheme is as follows: the hero and heroine meet. She is subconsciously attracted to his mysterious maturity, strength, and composure, but resists this impulse or is prevented from following it because of the enormous difference in their class background, education, or experience. She becomes conscious of her love, which has developed against her own will. A complication arises, which prevents her from declaring her feelings. The complication is re-

moved, the lovers are united, and she submits to his more powerful will and receives his love in return.

The ending resolves the tension between intimacy and power that dominates the relationship. In the ending the heroine is convinced that the hero's declaration of love is real. "The message is that nothing is as it seems: the apparently oppressive and exploitative face of male authority *disguises* the true love which may be consummated in the bond of paternalism."¹¹

Essentially, this is a story about powerlessness and submission to authority. The heroine gives up her independence in return for material security and emotional identity. The hero is always more mature than she is, confident of the situation, and financially independent; in other words, he is in a position to provide the security and identity she lacks. The feelings of the hero toward the heroine are of great importance, and much of the plot focusses on trying to understand them correctly, since everything ultimately hinges on his attitude to the heroine: if he dislikes her, he will ridicule and reject her; if he loves her, he will transform her life through marriage into one of joy and fulfillment.

When we transfer this scheme to our stories of the Ukrainian working class, we notice very similar codes. The hero is the powerful and confident Party activist, the inspired planner, or the exemplary worker. The heroine is the passive working class, the mass of young people, or the backward people looking for a new identity in the modern world. They, too, resist the hero's attractions, but finally their better feelings compel them to capitulate, declare their love, surrender their independence, and promise to do his, or the Party's, bidding. The feelings of the hero are constant, reliable, and noble; those of the weaker party, the working class, go through the ebb and flux of emotion until they are convinced of his good intentions and more developed understanding.

The question, then, arises: what are the deeper motives for such a literary structure, what are the cultural factors that require this kind of formula writing? First, it should be mentioned that there are two kinds of formula. One derives from the latest Party resolutions and instructions to writers: the Party decides that it is important to show the essential unity between the workers and the peasants, and immediately Mykytenko produces *Braty*; the Party resolves that it is important to show the benefits of mechanization, and Panch's *Povist nashykh dniv* appears; and so on. This method is, of course, still very much in evidence today. Writers

¹¹ J. Patterson, "Consuming Passion," *Fireweed* (Toronto), no. 11, p. 32.

in the Soviet Union consistently produce made-to-order works that aim to show the great changes the latest agricultural reforms have made in the countryside, the peaceful and enthusiastic cooperation of different nationalities in joint projects, the conversion of opponents to the Party's point of view. This, however, is only one kind of structure and of a more superficial kind. There are also deeper structures, such as the leader-led one examined in our discussion of the portrayal of the working class.

The latter represents an attempt at institutionalizing a certain ideology, at spreading it very widely, and eliciting automatic responses to it; hence its ubiquitousness and the virulent attacks on any challenges to it. The message in these stories is that the Party is right, that it loves the people and has their interests at heart, that the people ought to be obedient, disciplined, and hard-working. Conformity is everything; those who follow the rules and patterns of behaviour laid out in the stories by the positive heroes will be rewarded; those who deviate from these norms will be punished. The worst sins are individualism, insubordination, attempts at organizing opposition, contacts with foreigners, and so on.

The ultimate message is profoundly conservative: it argues that any resistance to the status quo will end in disaster, that Soviet society will always win out, and that the individual is nothing in the great scheme of things as seen from the Party heights. If the workers attempt to organize outside the Party, this will only lead to chaos and destruction; their greatest hope, the climax of their existence, is in their marriage to the Party. In this fashion the present structure of Soviet society is approved and confirmed, and the worker is instructed to bow to this inevitability.

One can only speculate that perhaps the insistence on this scheme with such force might signify some basic instability in this bond between the leaders and the led, which therefore requires a constant reinforcement. The plots vary, the surface "formulas" change, but at the deeper level the Soviet reader is compelled to relive over and over again the Party-masses bond as a sort of ritualistic "solution" to the fictional conflict.

It is precisely in its function as a ritual, a resolution of conflicts, and a validation of the system through fictional portrayal, that one should search for the meaning of the formula. These stories are a didactic device, a secular form of prayer that teaches submission to a spiritual authority. The hero and the working class are ultimately not even capable of reaching "consciousness" through their own willpower and activity; "consciousness," like grace in the Catholic Church, is in the end something that is a

gift from an absolute body outside man: from God or the Party. To live in a state of grace means to live in a condition of submission to the word of the Party.

The leader-led theme was particularly difficult to institutionalize in Ukraine and was resisted with great vigour at the time by literary forces outside the official VUSPP camp. Because of the political realities in Ukraine—a small, weak Ukrainian working class and the difficulties of establishing Bolshevik power in a hostile sea of Ukrainian peasantry—the entire literary struggle over this particular requirement of Bolshevik mythmaking was extraordinarily fierce and immediately developed strong political overtones. The debate over its institutionalization is one of the leitmotifs of the “Literary Discussion” of the 1920s and has survived as a bone of contention in Ukrainian criticism to this day.

Vivian Olender

THE CANADIAN METHODIST CHURCH AND THE GOSPEL OF ASSIMILATION, 1900—1925

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, when Ukrainian immigration began, Canada was involved in the process of nation building. A world depression was just ending, and by 1896 prosperity had returned to Canada. The government and people of Canada were advocating policies of national development. In order to ensure Canada's future prosperity, the development of the prairies was vital. To this end the Canadian government initiated an aggressive immigration policy. The population of Canada almost doubled from 1891 to 1914, with the increase occurring mainly on the prairies.

The Methodist Church was the largest Protestant body in Canada, and as the West opened for development it sent clergymen to the prairies to establish new congregations and maintain its position in Canadian society. Methodist missionaries were pioneers in the west, preaching first to the Indians and later to the scattered colonies of white settlers. Canadian Methodists believed their church had an important role to play in making Canada a great nation. That role was to make the Dominion of Canada "His Dominion," to build in Canada their share of the Kingdom of God.¹ The basic tenets of Methodist theology were repentance, justification by faith, and sanctification. Methodists were concerned not only with the sanctification of individuals, however, but also with the sanctification of society as a whole, for Christ came to earth to establish the Kingdom of God in society as well as in individual hearts.² The Methodists' aim was to establish the foundations of a society on the prairies that conformed to their

¹ Rev. William T. Gunn, *His Dominion* (Canada 1917), p. xiv.

² Alexander Sutherland, *The Methodist Church and Missions in Canada and Newfoundland. The Young People's Forward Movement for Missions. Text Book No. 4* (Toronto, 1906), p. 257.

vision of righteousness. The views and ideals of their church would thus permeate both the social and political institutions of this new society.

Methodist Sanction of Popular Opinion

At the turn of the century many Anglo-Canadians believed in the northern myth and the pseudoscientific myth of social Darwinism. The northern myth was based on the belief that the character of a race or ethnic group is the result of the challenge of climate. The peoples of northwestern Europe, and especially the Anglo-Saxons, had all the attributes of a dominant race, including reliance, initiative, and individual and personal strength. These were the traits needed to combat a harsh, rigorous climate. Conversely, the peoples of southern Europe were believed to be slow, lazy, and even effeminate or degenerate. The northern peoples expressed their rugged individualism in their choice of Protestantism with its simple, dignified churches and services symbolizing inner moral strength. The southern peoples belonged to the ritualistic and overdecorated Roman Catholic and Orthodox churches, whose laity were the pitiful victims of clericalism and priestcraft.³

Advocates of social Darwinism maintained that life was a continual struggle and that only the best competitors survived. The struggle of life always resulted in improvement or progress. The stronger races had an obligation to uplift the weaker races and to offer them the benefits of their superior civilization. In Canada the two myths were combined by the nationalists, who believed that the northern traits inherent in the Anglo-Saxon ethnic group, and the harsh Canadian climate would sustain the hardy characteristics of their people. Only the fittest would survive in Canada's cold climate, which provided "a persistent process of natural selection."⁴

³ Belief in a climatic myth was not a modern phenomenon. Its historical roots were grounded in the primitive view of the earth as the source of life. Classical scholars divided the earth into geographical zones and speculated on the effects of the elements on living things. Unlike their nineteenth-century counterparts, Graeco-Roman scholars believed that a hot climate influenced the development of an alert and imaginative mind, while a cold one produced a dull, apathetic, stolid people. J. W. Johnson, "Of Differing Ages and Climes," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 21 (1960): 465.

⁴ Carl Berger, "The True North Strong and Free," in *Nationalism in Canada*, ed. Peter Russel (Toronto, 1966), p. 9.

Because of the popularity of these myths, Anglo Canadians were ethnocentric in their attitudes towards all non-British immigrants. The Anglo-Saxon "race" was believed to be superior, and British traditions and institutions were given the highest ranking in the hierarchy of cultures. The greater the difference between the White Anglo-Saxon Protestant norm and the culture of the immigrant (whether actual or assumed), the lower the opinion of that culture and its people became. The popular racial myths and ethnic stereotypes were widely accepted and even sanctioned by the Canadian Methodist Church.⁵ By the late nineteenth century the Methodist Church had become an established middle-class institution. The middle-class laity, the main financial supporters of the church, were represented on the various boards and committees that formulated church policies. The end result was the accommodation of the gospel to middle-class WASP values.⁶

Since the Canadian Methodist Church equated Christian civilization with British civilization, it believed that the new society of the prairies must be a WASP society populated by British immigrants. The language of the West would be English, for English "is a world language, and, like the English people, seems destined to prevail over all the earth."⁷ To the dismay of the Methodists, the open-door policy of Wilfrid Laurier's Liberal government brought a tide of non-British immigrants to the prairies. These immigrants were seen as a threat because they did not fit into the Methodist vision of Canada as a homogeneous British Protestant country. Thus, rather than welcoming the new immigrants as brothers and sisters in Christ, Methodist clergymen gave pious sanction to popular opinion, condemning the new immigrants as members of an inferior race and church.

Descriptions of Ukrainians in Methodist literature emphasized juvenile or subhuman characteristics. Ukrainians were considered to be "like children,"⁸ and "dirty, unkempt, and unlettered" be-

⁵ Rev. F. A. Wightman, *Our Canadian Heritage, Its Resources and Possibilities* (Toronto, 1905); "Editorial Outlook," *The Christian Guardian*, 20 July 1904; Rev. George S. Payson, "The Future of the Anglo-Saxon Race," *Methodist Magazine and Review*, July-December 1898, pp. 55-57.

⁶ N. K. Clifford, "His Dominion: A Vision in Crisis," *Studies in Religion/Sciences Religieuses* 2 (1972-3): 315-25; idem, "The Religion of WASPs," *Christian Outlook*, April 1964, pp. 3-7.

⁷ Rev. Hugh Johnson, "An Anglo-American Brotherhood," *Methodist Magazine and Review*, January-June 1899, pp. 43-48, 118-23.

⁸ "Letter from E. Chambers," *Christian Guardian*, 4 September 1912, p. 21.

sides.⁹ Moreover, the "Slav seems a mighty beast but half-awakened,"¹⁰ who has "an inexhaustible flow of animal spirits."¹¹ The Ukrainian was deemed to have the same impulse towards good as the Anglo-Saxon, but to a lesser degree.¹² The Ukrainian method of childcare was described as "the survival of the fittest."¹³ Since Ukrainian woman worked so hard in the fields alongside their husbands, it was assumed that Ukrainian children must be neglected. Methodists also believed that Ukrainian "matrimonial affairs are not just like ours";¹⁴ however, this vague condemnation, often found in Methodist literature, was never substantiated by any specific accusation. Occasionally Methodists would admit that Ukrainians had one or two good points, but their bad traits usually outweighed the good, as illustrated in the following statement by T. C. Buchanan, superintendent of missions in Alberta:

To a very great degree they are ignorant and sordid people. Filthy in their home life, they are in great need of elevation in many ways. On the other hand, they are hard-working, industrious people; men, women and children are trained to work.¹⁵

The use of ethnic stereotypes was not confined to adult literature. Publications for children and young adults educated a new generation to believe in the superiority of the Anglo-Canadian ethnic group. Ukrainians, Methodist children were informed, were similar in appearance to Anglo-Canadians, but "most of them are shorter and stouter and maybe [sic] more dark faces."¹⁶ Ukrainians wore a "strange attire of innumerable layers,"¹⁷ so that it was difficult to distinguish the men from the women. Their favourite lunch was "bologne sausage and white bread."¹⁸ However, white bread was a delicacy similar to cake. Ukrainians usually ate black bread. A loaf of Ukrainian bread "weighs about ten pounds, is almost black and better when five or six years old." Then it is cut with an axe, and the slices are soaked in water,

⁹ "Our Canadian Land," *Missionary Outlook*, July 1909, p. 165.

¹⁰ Wm. F. Osbourne, "Neo-Latins versus Teutons," *Christian Guardian*, 6 May 1903, p. 8.

¹¹ Rev. W. H. Pike, "A Canadianizer's Ideal of Citizenship," *Missionary Bulletin*, 1919-20, no. 16, p. 240.

¹² "Immigration to Canada," *Missionary Outlook*, April 1910, p. 77.

¹³ "School Teaching among the Ukrainians," *The Canadian Epworth Era*, August 1911, p. 177.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵ Rev. T. C. Buchanan, "Domestic Missions," *Missionary Bulletin*, 1911-12, no. 8, p. 107.

which gives it a "fine flavour." Methodist children were also informed that the so-called Galicians were really the Galatians of the New Testament to whom the Apostle Paul wrote his epistle.¹⁹

A unique version of Ukrainian religious history was invented for the Methodist children. Apparently, at one time all Ukrainians belonged to the Greek church, and the tsar of Russia was its head.²⁰ However, the emperor of Austria wanted to seize Ukraine and incorporate it into his empire; therefore, he asked for the pope's help in this venture. The understanding was that the pope would help the emperor if all the Ukrainians were forced to become Catholics. The Ukrainians fought valiantly to keep their church but finally had to give in, although not without winning certain concessions from the pope. When the Ukrainians immigrated to Canada, the Roman Catholic Church tried to take back these concessions, but the Ukrainians resisted. Now the Ukrainians were rebelling against Rome's tyranny and looking to the Methodist Church for spiritual help.

The Methodist Church and Assimilation

Not only did Methodists believe that it was their right to set the standards of society, but also that it was their duty to guard these standards. In order to protect and preserve a homogeneous WASP society on the prairies, the Methodist Church realized that it must help in the work of assimilating the non-Anglo-Saxon immigrants.²¹ To preach the gospel of assimilation and middle-class WASP values to the new Canadians, the Methodist Church established "All Peoples' Missions" in the cities as well as an extensive network of rural home missions exclusively for the Ukrainian settlers. Like other continental Europeans, Ukrainians were considered to be members of an inferior race and church. However, Ukrainians were a greater threat to WASP society than other immigrant groups because they came to Canada in larger numbers and were highly visible in their traditional peasant garb. Furthermore, they had settled in large, isolated block colonies, which hindered the influence of the dominant WASP society.

¹⁶ C. W. Johnson, "What about Ruthenian Boys and Girls?" *Palm Branch*, April 1912, p. 2.

¹⁷ "As They Come to Us," *Palm Branch*, October 1907, pp. 2-3.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

¹⁹ *Ibid.* In the New Testament Galatia was a Roman province that included the mountain and plain area of central Turkey.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

The Methodists were afraid that as more and more Ukrainian immigrants arrived and became voting citizens, the unassimilated Ukrainians would use the power of their vote to bring Canada down to their level.²² Since Ukrainians were deemed to be unaccustomed to political rights and democratic institutions, they might use their newfound liberty as a "license to do evil" or to sell their vote to the highest bidder.²³ Much to the distress of the Methodists, Ukrainians were very eager to enter into politics. As early as 1902 the Stuartburn municipality in Manitoba had an Anglo-Canadian reeve, but the rest of the council was Ukrainian. In 1908 a Ukrainian reeve was elected. The Ukrainian-language press praised the efforts of the Stuartburn Ukrainians and encouraged other communities to follow their example. Soon Ukrainians were also elected to the provincial legislatures. Methodists were alarmed at these Ukrainian victories in the political arena. In their opinion it was imperative that the Ukrainian problem be tackled immediately, for "it would not be in the interests of civilization or the Kingdom of God for the government of Canada to pass into other hands."²⁴

Methodist Values and Ideals

The ideals the Methodists tried to promote in their home-mission program were capitalism, temperance, Sabbatarianism, woman's rights, and sanitation. Because of their middle-class background, Methodist missionaries were very concerned about the dangers of socialism. They refused to believe that one could be both a sincere Christian and a socialist. They assumed that the Ukrainians were a simple, childlike people who could easily be deceived by labour agitators, union advocates, and other so-

²¹ Assimilation is a process in which a member of a minority ethnic group discards and denies the culture, language, religion, and values of his ethnic group and replaces them with the traditions of the majority ethnic group or charter group. R. F. Bernard Mailhot, "Immigration vs Assimilation," *Studies and Documents on Immigration and Integration in Canada* 2 (August 1962): 28.

²² Rev. J. E. Hughson, "Our Missionary Work in the West," *Missionary Bulletin*, 1908-09, no. 5, pp. 404-5.

²³ *Annual Report of the Missionary Society of the Methodist Church*, 1912-13, pp. viii-ix. See also N. W. Rowell, "Home Mission Needs and Methods," *Christian Guardian*, 26 December 1902, p. 3.

²⁴ "Editorial: Immigration," *Missionary Outlook*, February 1915, p. 27.

cialist anarchists. Since socialism was equated with atheism, they hoped to combat this evil by spreading the true Christianity of the Methodist Church.

Temperance was one of the visible signs of a true Christian. Methodists were convinced that alcohol led to physical degeneracy,²⁵ and tobacco to stolidity.²⁶ Gambling and dancing were other serious sins. The Methodists vigorously campaigned throughout Canada to pass prohibition legislation. Since the Ukrainians were a significant minority in the west, their vote would have a determining influence. In the early 1920s Methodists were convinced that their prohibition campaign in Manitoba had failed because of the "foreign vote" and that the immigrants would also jeopardize their efforts in Saskatchewan.²⁷ Thus, preaching the evils of liquor and signing the pledge became an important part of the home-mission program.

Sabbatarianism was another area of conflict between the Ukrainians and the Methodists. In order to build the Kingdom of God in Canada, certain rules governing Sunday as a day of rest had to be established in the west. Methodists refused to participate in any recreational activity or work on the Sabbath. Ukrainian parties, weddings and christenings, which were usually held on Sundays, were harshly criticized by the Methodists. They objected particularly to drinking and dancing; immorality was usually implied, although specific accusations were not made. Methodists often assumed that if a person broke one of their moral codes, he had no qualms about breaking all of them. For example, one missionary referred to a Ukrainian wedding as a "vice trap."²⁸ Another missionary thought it prudent to leave the actual description of an immoral Ukrainian dance to the imagination of his Methodist readers: "I shall not attempt to describe

²⁵ "The Responsibility and Opportunity of the Sunday School in Temperance Work!" *The Canadian Epworth League*, April 1912, p. 93.

²⁶ "Question 7—Does cigarette smoking affect the moral character? Answer—Nearly all business houses refuse to employ cigarette smokers because they cannot be trusted. The users of cigarettes are careless, dull and irresponsible, if not dishonest." "Narcotic Catechism," *The Canadian Epworth League*, April 1912, p. 93.

²⁷ "Minutes of the Yorkton School Home Committee, May 27, 1924," Methodist Church, Canada. Missionary Society Home Department. Correspondence 1906-1926, Rev. James Allen, Rev. C. E. Manning, box 4, file 26. United Church Archives, Toronto, Ont.

²⁸ "All Peoples' Mission, Winnipeg," *Missionary Outlook*, October 1918, p. 224.

a Ruthenian dance, suffice it to say that the attitudes and poses of the dancers are anything but elevating.”²⁹

Methodists believed that the civilization of a people could be judged by the way women were treated. Because they assumed that Ukrainians belonged to an inferior civilization, they also assumed that Ukrainian women were not treated with dignity. Ukrainian women were the “drudge of the home.”³⁰ Middle-class Methodist women did not work outside the home; therefore, they were shocked to see Ukrainian women helping their husbands with the hard manual work on the farm. Some Methodists concluded that women were forced to work in the fields because their husbands were lazy:

The husband and father is the boss; he does not like hard work and allows his wife to do the heavy lifting and drudgery of the farm; he likes to loaf and smoke and keeps their church holidays religiously; he usually considers his family a burden and is a very poor father and provider.³¹

The Methodists did not realize that Ukrainians were too poor to hire help and that the women, and children as well, had to help in order to survive. The Ukrainian woman worked as hard as her husband and with her husband for their future in Canada. The main concern of middle-class WASP women was caring for the needs of their families. Because Ukrainian women worked so hard outside the home, one Methodist missionary in Vita concluded that they neglected both their housework and children:

Practically all women work very hard out of doors doing a man's work; they do very little housework and very few are able to do sewing; they are frequently ignorant as to the care of children; a common phrase, frequently heard from them is “too much work and lots of children are no good.”³²

The Methodists also wanted to “teach good taste . . . in English dress.”³³ One very ethnocentric Methodist wrote that Ukrai-

²⁹ Rev. W. H. Pike, “Work among the Austrians in Alberta,” *Missionary Bulletin*, 1910-11, no. 7, p. 669.

³⁰ Margaret Armstrong, “Everyday Life at Kolokreeka,” *Missionary Outlook*, March 1919, p. 55.

³¹ Ruby Manton, “Health and Home Conditions—Vita District,” Home Department Correspondence, box 4, file 24. United Church Archives, Toronto.

³² *Ibid.*

³³ Madeline Foley, “All Peoples’ Mission, Winnipeg, Manitoba,” *Missionary Bulletin*, 1911-12, no. 8, p. 1397.

nian "women were not allowed to wear skirts, a waist and a coarse hemp blanket being used."³⁴ The dress described was the traditional western-Ukrainian peasant costume, the "blanket" being the handwoven length of cloth worn as a wrap-around skirt with the beautifully embroidered *sorochka* (a long linen shirt). Ukrainian clothes were in fact of better quality and more durable than the cheap cotton material available in Canadian stores. The style was also well-suited for work in the garden. On the whole, Ukrainian dress was more practical and economical for Ukrainian women on the homesteads.

After reading Methodist missionary reports, one could only conclude that Ukrainians had a monopoly on dirt and enjoyed living in filth:

The sunshine seldom penetrates as far as the interior of their house and there is absolutely no ventilation except through the door. Foul odours and filth are prominent features. Flies exist in abundance; dogs and cats prowl around the house most contentedly.³⁵

A closer examination of many of the reports reveals that most Ukrainians were accused of being unsanitary because they lived in crowded conditions. Since most Ukrainians had large families and small houses, their homes were more cluttered and possibly not equal to the immaculate condition found in urban, middle-class WASP homes with their numerous bedrooms, bathrooms, and maids. Ukrainian homes were also considered unsanitary because they had earthen floors; however, the floors were covered with a mixture of clay and thus were as hard as cement floors and easy to sweep. Howard A. Kennedy, a British journalist who travelled throughout the west in this period, reported that Anglo-Canadian settlers were also ignorant of the primary facts of ventilation; they also did not bathe daily.³⁶ It should be emphasized again that the middle-class standard of living was always cited as the norm by Methodists. Ukrainians were criticized because their homes did not meet middle-class standards. Moreover, Methodists never compared Ukrainian settlers to their peers, that is, to Anglo-Saxon homesteaders who lived in log cabins or sod huts and endured similar primitive conditions during their first years on the prairies.

³⁴ "Advance Obligatory," *Missionary Outlook*, June 1908, p. 133.

³⁵ See n. 31.

³⁶ Howard A. Kennedy, *New Canada and the New Canadians* (Toronto, 1907), p. 243.

Methodist Opposition to Language Preservation

One tool Anglo Canadians hoped to use to assimilate the immigrants was the public-school system. However, in Manitoba they were confronted with the bilingual schools. According to an amendment of the Public School Act of Manitoba, Section 258, commonly called the Laurier-Greenway Agreement of 1897, the province was responsible for providing instruction in the mother tongue in areas where ten or more pupils had French or any other language as their mother tongue. A teacher's college, the Ruthenian Training School, was established in 1905 to provide Ukrainian-language teachers. In Saskatchewan and Alberta the Ukrainian language could legally be taught from three to four P.M. daily. Both provinces also had an English School for Foreigners, but no teachers colleges. In 1916 the bilingual schools and the Ruthenian Training School were abolished. Alberta and Saskatchewan followed Manitoba's example and closed their schools for immigrants and also prohibited instruction in Ukrainian in public-school buildings.

The Methodist Church was opposed to instruction in Ukrainian because it would hinder assimilation by preserving the language of the immigrant and the heterogeneous nature of western-Canadian society.³⁷ The Ukrainian-Canadian teachers were the early leaders and initiators of Ukrainian cultural and educational activities in Canada. They organized night classes for adults and lectures in Canadian political science and Ukrainian history, and fostered the development of cultural activities, including choirs, orchestras, and drama and dance groups. Protestant teachers were encouraged by the church to accept positions in Ukrainian block settlements in order to counteract the influence of the Ukrainian-Canadian teachers. An Anglo-Canadian teacher would have a respected position in the community and could set "Christian," that is, WASP, standards for the community to emulate. Methodists believed that three-quarters of the "foreign problem" could be solved by an adequate response of WASP teachers.³⁸

Ukrainian newspapers were also condemned by the Methodist Church. The first Ukrainian newspaper, *The Canadian Farmer*, was founded in 1903, and by 1925 there were over fifteen other

³⁷ "Schools in Manitoba," *Missionary Outlook*, May 1911, p. 103. See also *Minutes of the Annual Conference of the Methodist Church, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, 1914*, p. 45.

³⁸ Rev. John A. Doyle, "The Appeal of the West to the Young People of the East," *The Canadian Epworth Era*, July 1911, p. 163.

Ukrainian periodicals. If Ukrainians learned English, these newspapers would die; therefore, Methodists concluded that the papers exploited nationalism and opposed assimilation mainly for their own financial profit.³⁹ Methodists were especially hostile towards *The Ukrainian Voice*, which was founded by the Ukrainian-Canadian teachers and later became the official organ of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada. The head office of this paper was believed to be the headquarters of the Ukrainian nationalist movement in Canada.⁴⁰ To the Methodists, foreign-language newspapers and churches were only a temporary privilege, not a right of an ethnic minority in a free, democratic country.⁴¹ Ukrainian churches were generally referred to as "foreignizing agencies" or "foreignizing centres" that encouraged the preservation and perpetuation not only of the Ukrainian language, but also of inferior ideals and morals.⁴²

World War I

World War I provided ethnocentric Anglo-Canadians with a new and more blatant justification for their prejudice. All Austrian citizens became "enemy aliens" and were required to register with the government. The vast majority of these enemy aliens were actually Ukrainians, who were a dissident minority in the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Legislation against enemy aliens included the suspension of naturalization, which caused serious problems for Ukrainian homesteaders, who needed British citizenship to obtain final title to their land. The War Times Election Act of 1917 also deprived all former Austrian citizens of the right to vote. Ukrainian-language newspapers were suppressed at first and later required to print parallel bilingual columns. From 1919 to 1922 Ukrainians were again deprived of naturalization rights. Ironically, while an estimated 10,000 Ukrainians enlisted in the Canadian

³⁹ "How 'New Canadians' Get Their News," *Missionary Outlook*, February 1920, p. 30.

⁴⁰ Paul Crath et al., "Survey of Various Communities Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta Made under the Direction of the Boards of Social Service Methodist and Presbyterian Churches," n.d., United Church Archives, Toronto.

⁴¹ "A Judicial Definition of Allegiance," *Missionary Outlook*, January 1919, p. 6.

⁴² Rev. W. H. Pike, "The Methodist-Presbyterian Mission to New Canadians in Edmonton and Vicinity," *Missionary Outlook*, March 1922, p. 305.

armed forces, approximately 5,200 were arrested and placed in detention camps.⁴³

The First World War is described in Methodist literature as "the holiest and most unselfish in history,"⁴⁴ and the victory of the Allies, as "the vindication of Christian principles."⁴⁵ Thus, there is no criticism in Methodist records and publications of the discriminatory restrictions placed on Ukrainians. Rev. J. Smith, a home missionary in Alberta, justified the internment of Ukrainians with the utterly illogical claim that American Roman Catholic newspapers had "stirred up hard feelings" among the Ukrainians, with the result that some of them had managed to "get themselves into detention camps."⁴⁶ He implied that by their foolish actions the Ukrainians themselves were responsible for their internment, rather than popular prejudice sanctioned by his church.

After the war some Methodist ministers demanded that Ukrainian immigration be curtailed until the present population could be assimilated.⁴⁷ Other ministers were not as charitable toward Ukrainian settlers. Rev. E. Chambers, a prominent Methodist leader, believed that immigrants should be forced to make a definite decision either to assimilate or to return to Europe.⁴⁸ Rev. Wellington Bridgman, however, went further and demanded the deportation of all enemy aliens. He maintained that all former citizens of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, including Ukrainians, seemed to have "an innate morbid passion to shed blood" and were responsible for over ninety per cent of the crimes committed in Winnipeg.⁴⁹ Since enemy aliens lacked a moral instinct, they had no sincere desire to convert to true Christianity and thus could never become good Christian citizens. The British nation

⁴³ Joseph A. Bourdeau, "Western Canada's 'Enemy Aliens' in World War One," *Alberta Historical Review* 12 (1964): 1-9.

⁴⁴ "Shall We Leave Christ Out of the War?" *Missionary Outlook*, July 1918, p. 147.

⁴⁵ "Editorial: And on Earth, Peace!" *Missionary Outlook*, December 1918, p. 267.

⁴⁶ Rev. J. K. Smith, "Work in War Time among the Ruthenians in Edmonton," *Missionary Bulletin*, 1915-16, no. 12, p. 524.

⁴⁷ Rev. William Banks, "Our Mission to the Ukrainians," *Missionary Outlook*, April 1925, p. 77.

⁴⁸ Captain E. Chambers, "War Experiences and Peace Plans," *Missionary Bulletin*, 1919-20, no. 15, p. 134.

⁴⁹ Rev. (Capt.) Wellington Bridgman, *Breaking Prairie Sod: The Story of a Pioneer Preacher in the Eighties with a Discussion on the Question of Today*, "Shall the Alien Go?" (Toronto, 1920), p. 167.

was the new Israel, and like the Hebrews of old, they had to drive out the heathen aliens from their chosen land.⁵⁰

The war had made Methodists more aware of the problem of large blocks of unassimilated settlements that were often self-contained and self-sufficient.⁵¹ To their dismay, even older settlers who had been in Canada for two decades had resisted the forces of assimilation.⁵² Thus, even during the war, when the Methodist Church had a shortage of funds and staff, plans were being made for the extension of rural home missions to assimilate and convert the Ukrainians. By 1920 the *Annual Report of the Methodist Missionary Society* stated that its work had passed the initial stage and was now "assuming vast proportions" that demanded "most urgent attention."⁵³ In the 1924 *Annual Report*, Ukrainians were still considered to have a "medieval conception of religion," low standards of morality, hygiene and sanitation, and little regard for the value of life and the virtues of education.⁵⁴ The ethnic-stereotype descriptions of Ukrainians in the records and literature of 1925 were similar to descriptions written in the early years of the twentieth century. Although the northern myth and social Darwinism had lost their former popularity, a self-righteous belief in the superiority of WASP culture remained.

Conclusion

By 1925 Methodists realized that the task of evangelizing and assimilating the Ukrainians was not as easy as they assumed it to be at the beginning of the century. Ukrainians were not eagerly waiting to cast off the "bonds" of their church and to freely accept the "more excellent way" of the Methodist Church. The Methodists were now aware that Ukrainians were very loyal to both their church and heritage. The Ukrainian national movement was also acknowledged as a significant force of opposition to their work. Therefore, the hope of converting the Ukrainians en masse to the Methodist Church was abandoned, and a greater emphasis was placed on assimilation alone. By 1925 Methodists stressed that the success of their missionary work should not be judged by

⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 251.

⁵¹ *Annual Report*, 1919-20, p. x.

⁵² Banks, p. 77.

⁵³ *Annual Report*, 1919-20, pp. xi, xxiii.

⁵⁴ *Annual Report*, 1924, p. 47.

the number of converts, but by the extent to which WASP values and ideals had permeated the Ukrainian community.⁵⁵

This change in emphasis in home-mission work was also influenced by internal changes in the Methodist Church. The gradual acceptance of biblical criticism and a more liberal theology led to the decline of evangelical theology with its stress on personal conversions. However, the end result desired in both the early and postwar periods was the same. In the early period, evangelical Methodists believed that if a Ukrainian were converted, he would also embrace the true Christian civilization and want to assimilate. The assimilation policy was also supported by other factions in the Methodist Church, such as advocates of the social gospel, who were certainly more aware of class distinctions and economic and social problems than the evangelicals, but were still blinded by ethnocentrism. Thus, in 1925 the Methodist Church continued to see Canada only in terms of a homogeneous WASP country, and the Ukrainian immigrant as a threat to society until he was assimilated.

⁵⁵ "Canadian Ranok Committee Minutes," Ranok Report, 1925. United Church Archives, Toronto.

ДИСКУСІЯ ПРО ОУН

У статті "The Political Thought of Soviet Ukrainian Dissent" (т. 6, ч. 2, осінь 1981), проф. Іван Лисяк-Рудницький протиставляє ідейні позиції українського дисидентського руху філософії та політичній програмі Організації Українських Націоналістів. Він пише:

Дисиденти виявили найглибшу пошану до героїчної боротьби під час війни Української Повстанської Армії, яку створила ОУН, відкидаючи водночас схильність ОУН до диктатури і влади одної партії... У протиставленні до ксенофобії націоналізму ОУН, гарячий патріотизм сучасного українського дисидентського руху не включає ворожості до інших народів, навіть до росіян (стор. 10-11).

Отож автор обвинувачує ОУН у двох гріхах: у прагненні до монопольної диктатури та у ксенофобії. При цьому, з наведених цитат видно, що він говорить про ОУН під час німецько-совєтської війни, бо власне тоді народилася УПА, якої утворення ініціювала ОУН.

У такому пляні, такі обвинувачення на адресу тієї ОУН воєнного і післявоєнного періоду є позбавлені ґрунту і розходяться з історичною правдою. Згадана ОУН ані не прагнула до монопольної влади в Україні, ані не проповідувала ненависти до інших народів. Вистачить познайомитися з доступними на Заході документами ОУН і УПА, щоб переконатися у безпідставності тверджень проф. Рудницького.

Звичайно, я говорю про ту фракцію ОУН в Україні, яка під час війни між Німеччиною і СРСР була відома на українських землях як "ОУН під проводом Степана Бандери". Про неї, як я щойно згадав, говорить теж проф. Рудницький. Поскільки Бандера сидів у німецькому концентраційному таборі під час німецько-совєтської війни, тією фракцією ОУН керував від липня 1941 року до 13 травня 1943 року Микола Лебедь, як "урядуючий провідник", а від тієї дати аж до 5 березня 1950 року Роман Шухевич, як голова Бюра Проводу ОУН, коли він загинув у бою з більшовиками.

Програма тієї ОУН була скодифікована в Постановах III Великого Надзвичайного Збору ОУН, що відбувся на українських землях 21-25 серпня 1943 року, а згодом доповнена і уточнена постановами Проводу ОУН в Україні в 1950 році. В порівнянні з програмовими постановами всіх попередніх Великих Зборів ОУН з 1929, 1939 і 1941 років, які, до речі, відбувалися поза українськими землями, це була нова програма, в основу якої був покладений досвід, що його ОУН здобула в умовах протинімецької боротьби та зустрічі з наддніпрянськими українцями. У програмах з 1929, 1939 і 1941 років знаходяться елементи монопартійности, диктатури та вождівства. Там говориться про те, що "ОУН побудована на засадах всеукраїнства, надпар-

тійності і монокраїзму”, або що ОУН бореться за українську державу на основах “одної політичної організації провідного національного активу”¹, або що “Голова ПУН [Проводу Українських Націоналістів] — як керманіч і репрезентант визвольних змагань Української Нації — є її Вождем”.²

Інакше ці проблеми поставлені в програмових постановах ОУН, схвалених в Україні в 1943 і 1950 роках. У них м. ін. читаємо:

ОУН бореться проти імперіялістів та імперій, бо в них один пануючий народ поневолює культурно та визискує економічно інші народи. Тому ОУН бореться проти СРСР і проти німецького націонал-соціалізму. ОУН з усією рішучістю бореться проти інтернаціоналістичних та фашистсько-націонал-соціалістичних програм та політичних концепцій. . . ОУН за повне визволення українського народу з-під московсько-большевицького ярма, за побудову Української Самостійної Соборної Держави без поміщиків, капіталістів та без большевицьких вельмож, енкаведистів і партійних паразитів. . . В лавах ОУН борються українські селяни, робітники й інтелігенти проти гнобителів — за Українську Самостійну Соборну Державу, за національне й соціальне визволення, за демократичний державний порядок та справедливий соціальний лад. . . [ОУН бореться] за свободу друку, слова, думки, переконань, віри й світогляду. Проти офіційного накидування суспільності світоглядних доктрин і догм. За свободу політичних і громадських організацій.³

А в підпільному офіціозі Проводу ОУН “Ідея і чин”, що появлявся під час німецької окупації України і згодом аж до 1949 року, читаємо у випуску з 1943 року:

Організовані українські націоналісти борються за інтереси українського народу. Їм чужі ідеї панування над народом. . . Тому ми проти накидування народіві самозванчих “вождів”.⁴

Зайво пояснювати, що такі програмові постанови і такі писання діячів ОУН виключали “схильність ОУН до диктатури і влади одної партії”, про які пише проф. Рудницький.

Також у внутрішній структурі ОУН проведено під час протинімецької боротьби ОУН важливі зміни. Рішенням Проводу ОУН з 13 травня скасова-

¹ ОУН в світлі постанов Великих Зборів, Конференцій та інших документів з боротьби 1929-1955 рр. Видання Закордонних Частин Організації Українських Націоналістів. 1955, стор. 6 і 28. Далі ОУН в світлі постанов Великих Зборів.

² Зиновій Книш. Устрій Організації Українських Націоналістів. Вінніпег — Буенос Айрес, 1952, стор. 15.

³ ОУН в світлі постанов Великих Зборів, стор. 107, 108, 112.

⁴ Вировий М. В. “Революційний фронт українського самостійництва”, Ідея і чин, 1943, ч. 2, стор. 12.

но пост “урядуючого провідника”, а в керівництві Проводу поставлено Бюро Проводу, що його очолив Роман Шухевич. Тоді теж на місце провідницького принципу уведено принцип колегіальності рішень керівних органів ОУН.

Стільки про “диктатуру” в програмі ОУН воєнного і післявоєнного часу. А тепер про “ксенофобію” ОУН. Тут проф. Рудницький теж помиляється.

Про відношення ОУН до інших народів дають свідчення згадані вище Постанови III Великого Надзвичайного Збору ОУН з серпня 1943 року. Там м. ін. читаємо:

Організація Українських Націоналістів бореться за Українську Самостійну Соборну Державу й за те, щоб кожна нація жила вільним життям у своїй власній самостійній державі... [ОУН бореться] за повне право національних меншостей плекати свою власну по формі й змісту національну культуру. За рівність всіх громадян України, незалежно від їх національності в державних та громадських правах та обов'язках, за рівне право на працю, заробіток і відпочинок.⁵

А у згадуваному вже журналі “Ідея і чин” висуюються в 1943 році м. ін. такі вимоги політики у відношенні до меншостей України:

Творити найкращі форми щоденного співжиття українського суспільства з національними меншостями. Двигати з ними солідарно всі тягарі, що випливають зі стану окупації і поневолення України чужинцями.⁶

Де тут елементи будь-якої ксенофобії?

Опоненти ОУН інколи посилаються на декалог ОУН, в якому, м. ін. говорилося про поневолення чужинців в ім'я “поширення багатства і простору” свого народу. Така пропозиція справді була в декалозі. Ясно, що її ніяк оправдати не можна і її треба засуджувати. Народ, що бореться за свободу, не може хотіти неволі для інших. Але справа в тому, що ця точка декалогу, зрештою і він у цілості, були короткотривалою появою в ОУН під польською окупацією в 1930-их роках і що він ніколи не став офіційно схваленим документом ОУН. Не слід також забувати, що політику поневолювання чужинців в ім'я “поширення багатства і простору” свого народу вели впродовж сторіч усі імперіяльні потуги Сходу і Заходу. Тільки що вони до цього ніколи не признавалися, а свої хижацькі походи

⁵ ОУН в світлі постанов Великих Зборів, стор. 107, 112.

⁶ Степанів О. І. “За правильний підхід”, *Ідея і чин*, 1943, ч. 2, стор. 23. прикривали шляхетними гаслами “цивілізаційної місії білої людини” або потреби “братньої допомоги” чи “визволення” інших народів. Український народ досі відчуває на своїй спині тип такої “допомоги”.

Це правда, що похідні групи ОУН в 1941 році голосили гасло “Україна для українців”. Але важко в цьому було б добачуватися ворожості до чужинців. Поперше, бажання народу бути господарем на своїй землі не є злочином, воно природне для кожного народу. Французи теж вважають, що Франція є для французів, англійці — що Англія є для англійців, а голосне під час польської онови в 1980-81 роках гасло “щоб Польща була Польщею” є також висловом цього природного прагнення поляків бути господарями своєї землі. Подруге, гасло “Україна для українців” має в нас свою традицію — Микола Міхновський. Потрете, в умовах німецької окупації, коли стало ясне, що німці хочуть перетворити Україну у свою колонію, таке гасло мало своє повне оправдання. Коли однак вже восени 1941 року ОУН та її похідні групи занехали це гасло, то зробили вони це тому, що воно могло антагонізувати меншості України. Звідси теж сильний акцент позитивного ставлення до меншостей у згаданих Постановках з 1943 року.

Ще до питання відношення ОУН до російського народу. Тут також проф. Рудницький неоправдано протиставляє позиції українського дисидентського руху програми ОУН. Документи підпільної літератури ОУН ясно проводять лінію поділу між російським народом і російськими імперіялістами. ОУН ніколи не проповідувала ненависті до інших народів і не обвинувачувала весь російський народ у злочинах супроти України. Але вона теж не мала ілюзій, щодо того, що російські імперіялісти зуміли затруїти чадом шовінізму ширші кола російського народу і щодо того, що, на жаль, число росіян, які визнають право українського чи інших неросійських народів СРСР на незалежність від Росії, є мале.

Документи ставлення ОУН до російського народу з часів війни і після неї, що появилися в Україні, є доступні на Заході для заінтересованих людей, зокрема для істориків. Про це питання читаємо м. ін. у згаданому вже органі “Ідея і чин” за 1943 рік таке:

Виповівши нещадну боротьбу московському імперіялізмові... і мобілізуючи всі сили проти його намагань далі поневолювати Україну, ми в цей спосіб не виповідаємо війни московському народові, бо ми не хотіли б з ним ані сьогодні ані завтра воювати... Московський народ теж прагне волі і свободи. Він має на це повне право... Всім меншостям, що живуть на Україні, отже і московській, український народ визнає повну рівноправність та кличе їх до спільної боротьби за УССД, що забезпечить повноту розвитку, соціальну справедливість та культурне життя всім жителям України. Український народ кличе всіх, хто живе на Україні до спільної боротьби проти німецьких імперіялістів, що поневолюють Україну та проти московського імперіялізму.⁷

⁷ Вировий М. В. “Україна і Росія”, *Ідея і чин*, 1943, ч. 3, стор. 9, 10.

Відомою на Заході, теж у перекладах на чужі мови, є стаття одного з найвидатніших публіцистів українського визвольного підпілля, члена Проводу ОУН в Україні, Осипа Горнового, "Наше становище до російського народу", в якій він пише:

Наше становище до російського народу нічим не відрізняється від нашого становища до всіх інших народів. Воно випливає з основних наших ідейно-політичних засад: воля народам! воля людині!... Відокремлення України звернене не проти російського народу, а виключно проти російсько-більшевицьких імперіалістів, знищення яких є також в інтересі російського народу... Російський народ — наш безпосередній сусід, з ним в нас багато суспільних інтересів, і співпраця наша може розвиватися дуже успішно, якщо вона буде будована на справжній дружбі і рівноправності... З прикрістю в цьому місці ми мусимо ствердити, що російський народ давав — і дає — з себе робити знаряддя політики гноблення й експлуатації України в руках своїх імперіалістичних керівників.⁸

У світлі цих документів програми ОУН та мислення її провідних діячів, зайво українцеві вибачатися за українську "ксенофобію", а вже поготів обвинувачувати інших українців у ворожому становищі до чужинців.

Вкінці таке. Свою критику ОУН проф. Рудницький спирає на спогадах одного з провідних учасників українського руху опору, Данила Шумука. Звичайно, оцінками Шумука ніяк не можна нехтувати. Важливе однак і те, що в сотнях, чи більше, документах українського самвидаву, зокрема у свідченнях десятків інших видатних діячів українського руху опору, які на волі, і згодом в концтаборах та в'язницях СРСР зустрічалися з членами ОУН, отже і з їх політичними поглядами, критичних оцінок того типу, що пише Шумук і проф. Рудницький, не знаходиться. Вимовне те, що О. Солженіцин, який у своїй багатотомовій праці "Архипелаг Гулаг" чимало місця призначив теж для учасників українського визвольного підпілля, з якими він зустрічався в советських таборах, позитивно говорить про них та про ідеї, яким вони служать.

Мирослав Прокоп

⁸ О. Горновий. "Наше становище до російського народу". Цит. з Сучасна Україна, Мюнхен, 22 липня 1951, стор. 3.

НАЦІОНАЛІЗМ І ТОТАЛІТАРИЗМ

(Відповідь М. Прокопові)

У зв'язку з критичними зауваженнями д-ра Мирослава Прокопа мушу передусім вяснити, що в моїй статті, присвяченій політичній думці сучасних українських підрадянських дисидентів, я не ставив собі за завдання вичерпно розглянути теорію і практику українського націоналістичного руху міжвоєнного, воєнного та післявоєнного періодів. Це окрема велика тема, що не входила в програму даної праці. У статті так і було сказано: "Тут не місце для обговорення генези й розвитку українського комунізму та інтегрального націоналізму (фашизму)". Проблему українських тоталітарних течій, комунізму й націоналізму, порушено в статті тільки побіжно, на маргінесі інших справ. Таким чином, характеризуючи націоналістичний табір кількома загальними штрихами, я не мав потреби ані можливості зупинятися на деталях і нюансах.

Мені приємно ствердити, що Прокопова оцінка ідейного обличчя націоналістичного руху до 1941 року близька до моєї. Він пише: "У програмах [Організації Українських Націоналістів] з 1929, 1939 і 1941 років знаходяться елементи монопартійности, диктатури та вождівства". Це важливе признание, що його варто згадати. Але, на мою думку, д-р Прокоп не йде тут досить далеко. Суть справи не в окремих "елементах програми" ОУН, але в цілій суспільній природі націоналістичного руху, яка була виразно тоталітарна та співзвучна з фашистськими течіями, що в тому часі ширилися в багатьох європейських країнах.

Д-р Прокоп закидає мені, що я не взяв до уваги змін, які наступили в ОУН (мова про її "бандерівську" або "революційну" фракцію) після 1941 року та які, мовляв, перетворили її природу з тоталітарної на демократичну. Постараюся відповісти на цей закид, наскільки це можливо в рамках короткого дискусійного допису.

Заки перейти до розгляду конкретних питань, що їх порушив д-р Прокоп, хочу вказати на один методологічний недолік у його аргументації. Коли намагаємося пізнати сутність будь-якої суспільно-політичної формації, не можемо обмежуватися, як це робить д-р Прокоп, до офіційних документів декларативного характеру. Вони, очевидно, мають певне значення і їх слід враховувати, але вони не дають повного образу дійсности. (Чи можна, напр., виробити собі правильне уявлення про комуністичний режим на підставі самих параграфів радянської конституції?) Тому тут конче треба брати до уваги низку інших визначальних факторів, таких як тип політичної культури та духовий клімат даної формації, її організаційну структуру та, що мабуть найважливіше, її методи діяння, тобто практику.

Програмові документи ОУН(р) з 1943 і наступних років, на які посилається д-р Прокоп, мені відомі. Вони засвідчують, що в період німецької

окупації в тому середовищі, або принаймні в деяких його колах, існували тенденції до ідейного ревізйонізму, до відходу від попередніх тоталітарних позицій. Те помітне явище, яке з нашої сучасної перспективи можемо оцінювати тільки позитивно, було наслідком зустрічі західньоукраїнських націоналістів з наддніпрянськими земляками, що переважно не могли сприйняти оунівської ідеології, а також реакцією на хижацький гітлерівський окупаційний режим в Україні. Але питання в тому, наскільки цей ревізйоністський процес був органічний і глибокий, чи він охопив цілу організацію та, передусім, чи він зі сфери програмових гасел перейшов до сфери практичної діяльності. Д-р Прокоп хоче нас переконати, що партія, яка ще в 1941 році дотримувалася засад монопартійної диктатури, за яких два-три роки стала демократичною. Така швидка метаморфоза межувала би з чудом, в яке трудно повірити. Отже, признаючи наявність ідейного ферменту, не бачу достатніх підстав, які дозволяли б говорити про докорінну зміну суспільної природи ОУН(р) в тому часі.

Якби згаданий фермент дійсно виражав еволюцію партії в цілому, це прямування мусіло б перемогти після 1945 року на еміграції, особливо якщо зважити, що довілля демократичних країн Заходу повинно було сприяти такому розвитку. Як знаємо, цього не сталося. Велика більшість еміграційних членів і прихильників бандерівської партії не пішла за ревізйоністами. Ревізйоністська меншість, що включала культурніші та політично більш вироблені елементи, утворила окреме угруповання, відоме популярно під назвою "двійкарів" або "угаверівців", яке, до речі, з часом відійшло від традиційної оунівської ідеології та поступово здемократизувалося. Зате загальне членство ОУН(р) станув по боці лідерів, що завертали партію до націоналістичної ортодоксії 1930-их років. Бандерівська організація досі перебуває на цих старих, "безкомпромісових" позиціях, не зважаючи на їх явну анахронічність. Цей факт доказує, як глибоко націоналістичний рух був просяклий тоталітарним світоглядом. Неподолана спадщина оунівського тоталітаризму досьогодні тяжить над життям української діаспорійної громадськості.

Інше питання, які форми був би прийняв націоналістичний рух, коли б він мав можливість продовжити своє існування на рідних землях. Але поскільки націоналістичне підпілля було там знищене приблизно до 1950 року, історія не дала на це питання однозначної відповіді. Нова хвиля руху опору, що виникла в Україні в шістдесятих-сімдесятих роках під назвою дисидентського або правозахисного руху, не була прямим продовженням колишнього оунівського націоналізму, від якого вона відрізняється своїми людськими кадрами, методами діяльності та ідейним спрямуванням. Недавні бандерівське середовище на еміграції поставилося вороже до тих представників дисидентського руху, що їм пощастило опинитися на Заході.

Але повернімся до того періоду, що про нього йде розмова між д-ром Прокопом і мною. Мій шановний опонент запевняє, що в 1943 і наступних

роках ОУН(р) буцімто не виявляла нахилу до монопольної диктатури. Чи можна цей відносно короткий відрізок часу виривати з контексту всієї історії націоналістичного руху? Пригадаймо, що від свого постановня ОУН, тоді ще єдина, послідовно відкидала концепцію внутрішньо-українського політичного плюралізму. ОУН не хотіла бути тільки одною з українських партій, нарівні з іншими. Вона розглядала себе як єдину силу, покликану очолити боротьбу українського народу за самостійність та як єдиного носія влади в майбутній українській державі, відродження якої здавалося тоді близьким. Ставлення ОУН до інших українських течій, партій і центрів та всіх інакомислячих земляків було крайньо нетерпиме, а до політичних противників націоналісти застосовували морального, іноді теж фізичного терору. На це можна б навести чимало прикладів ще з довоєнного періоду. Розлам в ОУН 1940 року нічого не змінив у цьому відношенні. Обі націоналістичні фракції, мельниківська та бандерівська, надалі змагали до неподільної влади, при чому бандерівська фракція, як численніша та динамічніша, показувала більшу безоглядність і агресивність.

Ця тенденція до монопартійної диктатури появилась яскраво в т. зв. Акті Проголошення Української Держави з 30 червня 1941 року. Перше речення цього документу звучить: "Волею Українського Народу, Організація Українських Націоналістів під проводом Степана Бандери проголошує створення [в деяких варіантах, "відновлення"] Української Держави...". А кінчається він такими закликами: "Хай живе Організація Українських Націоналістів! Хай живе Провідник Організації Українських Націоналістів, Степан Бандера!". Іншими словами, ОУН(б) заявила себе єдиним речником "волі Українського Народу". В акті не згадано ні словом про традиції української державности 1917—21 років, зате там говориться про боротьбу ОУН. Але найсуттєвіше, що **партія** покликувала до життя **державу**, що, очевидно, означало підпорядкування держави, яка мала творитися, виключній контролі одної партії. Апологети бандерівщини кажуть, що метою "проголошення" було поставити німців перед доконаний факт. Правильніше буде ствердити, що метою було поставити перед доконаний факт українське громадянство, ще приголомшене та дезорієнтоване після советського терору, та узурпувати владу, перебігши дорогу мельниківським суперникам. Не можна не підкреслити жахливого примітивізму політичної думки, віддзеркаленого в цьому документі. В порівнянні з ним універсали Центральної Ради, яким теж можна чимало закинути щодо змісту й форми, виглядають як шедеври державницького мислення та політичної культури. Мене дивує, що д-р Прокоп, який будує свою аргументацію на цитатах з програмових документів, не вважав за відповідне зупинитися на Акті 30 червня 1941 року, що як-не-як претендував на те, щоб бути документом державно-правного значення.

Чи бандерівська ОУН відійшла від концепції монопольної диктатури в наступні роки, тобто під час німецької окупації? Тому що політичне життя

могло тоді виявлятися переважно тільки в підпільних, конспіративних формах, багато в історії того періоду досі залишається темним. Але доступні фрагментарні інформації не говорять в користь Прокопової тези. І так тогочасна публічна опінія приписувала бандерівцям відповідальність за убивства ряду провідних діячів конкуруючої мельниківської фракції, до речі, ветеранів націоналістичного руху та в минулому найближчих співробітників "вождя" Євгена Коновальця. Цих тяжких закидів, повторених в повоєнній мельниківській публіцистиці на еміграції, не можна вважати за доведені, але вони, поскільки мені відомо, ніколи не були належно спростовані. Далі: в 1943 році ОУН(р) підпорядкувала собі Українську Повстанську Армію, насильно усунувши її первісне керівництво. Згідно зі спогадами першого командира УПА, отамана Тараса Бульби-Боровця ("Армія без держави", Вінніпег, 1981), суть конфлікту полягала в тому, що він хотів розвивати партизанський рух на загальнонаціональній, понадпартійній платформі, тоді як бандерівці прагнули зробити з УПА збройне рам'я своєї партії, чого вони, зрештою, досягли. Якщо свідчення Бульби-Боровця згідне з історичною правдою, то це тяжко погодити з тезою д-ра Прокопа. (Користаю з нагоди, щоб виправдати одну неточність у моїй статті, де я написав, що "УПА була твором ОУН". Я повинен був сказати, що УПА від 1943 року перебувала під політичною контролею бандерівської організації.)

В кінцевій фазі війни постала Українська Головна Визвольна Рада, що була подумана як політична надбудова УПА та зав'язок підпільного уряду. У Платформі УГВР, проголошеній у липні 1944, знаходиться низка демократичних гасел щодо політичного й соціально-економічного устрою в майбутній українській державі. Це був відрадний симптом ідейного ревізйонізму, що проходив серед частини бандерівського табору. Але програмові кличі легше міняти, ніж організаційну структуру, а реально остання мабуть важить більше. Проголошувана пропагандивно понадпартійність УГВР була фікцією. Насправді УГВР була сконструйована за рецептою "блюку партії з безпартійними". Крім цього, в руках однієї людини, Романа Шухевича, сконцентровано три функції: лідера партії, командира збройних сил і шефа "уряду". Можливо, що такі структурні розв'язки були подиктовані практичними кончностями тодішньої ситуації. Проте, в усякому випадку, трудно тут дошукатися відмови від засад монопартійности й вождизму.

Переходжу до другої суперечливої проблеми, що її д-р Прокоп порушив у своєму дописі. Він уважає, що з не маю рації, приписуючи ОУН ксенофобію. Методологічне розходження тут між нами таке саме, що й попередньо. Я характеризував націоналістичний рух у цілому, тоді як д-р Прокоп виділяє з цієї цілоти певні ізольовані та, на мою думку, нетипові аспекти. Знаємо, що під час німецької окупації пропаганда ОУН(р) знечев'я заговорила про "свободу народам, свободу людині". Але це шляхетне гасло перебувало в суперечності з традиційним націоналістичним світоглядом і вільно сумніватися, чи відповідала йому тодішня практика бандерівської організації.

На цьому місці не можна не згадати Дмитра Донцова, що його публіцистична творчість мала вирішальний вплив на формування ідейного обличчя націоналістичного руху. Щоправда Донцов не був членом ОУН, отже його писання не мали, так би мовити, офіційного характеру. Проте нема сумніву, що саме Донцов був ідеологічним ментором націоналістичного покоління тридцятих-сорокових років у Західній Україні та що націоналістичний рух увійшов в історію "з його духа печаттю". Донцов усім своїм авторитетом спрямовував український націоналізм у фашистське русло. Він систематично насаджував ксенофобію й шовінізм, зокрема щодо Росії, — не тільки російського імперіялізму, але саме російського народу й культури. При цьому він принципово відкидав універсальні моральні й інтелектуальні вартості, що спільні для всього людства. Вихованці Донцова повірили, що "інтерес нації" це єдиний критерій, що вирішує все та що ним усе можна виправдати; у практиці національний інтерес легко ототожнювався з інтересом партії, як єдиного репрезентанта нації. Наслідком такої школи було загрозливе зниження рівня політичної культури західноукраїнського суспільства, що його найактивнішою політичною силою в тому часі був націоналістичний рух. Не говорячи навіть про етичний бік справи, сліпе зневажництво утруднювало раціональне політичне планування та відповідальні рішення. Дух донцовського шовінізму досі покутує серед частини української еміграції, про що можна легко перекоонатися, гортаючи сторінки нашої преси.

Д-р Прокоп твердить, що в 1943 і наступних роках ОУН(р) не була ксенофобською й шовіністичною. Він посилається на стосовні організаційні постанови й писання підпільних публіцистів. Але щоб ідейна еволюція будь-якого політичного табору виглядала переконливо, вона мусить бути відповідно умотивована, вона вимагає чесного розрахування з власним минулим. У націоналістичних програмових документах того часу не знаходимо такої самокритики та, зокрема, відмежування від донцовщини. На тлі всієї попередньої теорії і практики націоналістичного руху, раптово висунений клич свободи народам і людині нагадував приповідкову "квітку на кожусі".

Д-р Прокоп наводить уривок зі статті чільного підпільного публіциста, Осипа Горнового, в якій проведена диференціація між російсько-більшовицьким імперіялізмом та російським народом і де мовиться про можливість майбутніх добросусідських стосунків з російським народом. Ці розумні думки можна, звичайно, тільки похвалити. Але при цьому слід тямити, що ОУН-УПА, що діяла на західноукраїнських землях, з російським народом практично майже не стикалася. Отже характер міркувань Горнового був, скажім, академічний. Зате в Західній Україні існували з давніх-давен дві великі національні меншості, єврейська (за нашою традиційною номенклатурою, жидівська) та польська. Як до них ставився табір ОУН?

Як усі знаємо, в Україні сталася під час німецької окупації безпрецедентна трагедія: поголовний геноцид єврейського населення. Відповідальність за цей страхітливий злочин падає на німецький нацистський режим,

хоч не можна заперечити, що допоміжну роль зіграли теж деякі українці (органи місцевої адміністрації, "українська" поліція). Хто ж був покликаний запротестувати в імені українського народу проти гітлерівського злочинства? В тодішніх умовах це могло зробити тільки націоналістичне підпілля, що діяло незалежно від окупаційної влади. Чейже ОУН, особливо бандерівська, відбувала нелегальні конференції, проголошувала різні декларації, видавала безцензурну пресу тощо. Таким чином, не було ніякої об'єктивної перешкоди, щоб ОУН(р) не могла засудити геноциду євреїв та перестерігти українців перед співучастю в нацистських звірствах. Є ситуації, коли не вільно мовчати, бо той, що має змогу протестувати й цього не робить, цим показує, що він згоджується. Мовчанка оунівського табору в обличчі трагедії українського єврейства дуже промовиста. Оунівці, очевидно, не вважали євреїв за співгромадян української землі, доля яких не може бути байдужа етнічним українцям. Але яким правом можна тоді твердити, що націоналістичне середовище було вільне від духу ксенофобії та шовінізму?

Друга несамовита трагедія, що сталася в Західній Україні за роки Другої світової війни, це тодішня польсько-українська різня. Не стану заглиблюватися в подробиці цієї кошмарної справи, що про неї вже існує ціла література (переважно польська), але що в ній досі багато неясного. Це тема для спеціальних досліджень. Поскільки тепер можна судити, вина падала на обі сторони: терор і озвіріння були обопільні, а з відстані часу не легко встановити, хто "перший почав". Польський політичний провід напевне причинився до спровокування катастрофи своїм нехтуванням прав українського народу до вільного життя на його споконвічній етнічній території та своєю твердолобою постановою в питанні щодо державної приналежності галицько-волинських земель. Але в даному випадку йдеться про відповідальність української сторони. Є підстави думати, що з українського боку мали місце не льокальні, стихійні експеси, але що проводилася свідомо кампанія "очищування терену" від польського населення. Якщо ця гіпотеза правильна, то стосовні рішення могли вийти тільки від проводу ОУН(р).

Ми колись мали право пишатися тим, що за нашої новітньої державности на території Західньо-Української Народної Республіки в 1918-19 роках, — не зважаючи на війну, що точилася проти польської агресії, — не було ані одного протипольського або противрейського погрому. Своєю поведінкою супроти польської та єврейської меншостей оунівці не принесли доброї слави імені українського народу. Пам'ять про ці жалюгідні події утруднює співпрацю українських самостійницьких чинників з поляками та євреями, яка сьогодні й на майбутнє потрібна і їм і нам, але нам більше ніж їм, бо ми слабші та політично в гіршій ситуації.

Д-р Прокоп помиляється, що "свою критику ОУН проф. Рудницький спирає на спогадах одного з провідних учасників руху опору, Данила Шумука". Як я вже пояснив на початку, критика ОУН не була темою моєї статті, де це питання зачеплено тільки принагідно і для чого я не потребу-

вав Шумука, бо на дану справу я мав здавна свій власний вироблений погляд. Значення спогадів Шумука для моєї статті не як історичного джерела, тобто не в тому, що там сказано про ОУН—УПА воєнного періоду. (Хоч мушу додати, що Шумук справляє враження достовірного свідка, тоді коли в писаннях про ці речі еміграційних мемуаристів і публіцистів часто знаходимо більше патріотичної мітотворчості та партійної апологетики ніж об'єктивної, неприкрашеної історичної правди.) Спогади Шумука важливі в контексті моєї статті як документ політичної думки сучасного підрадянського українського руху опору, тобто своїми програмовими висновками. Шумук відкидає обі тоталітарні альтернативи, марксизм-ленізм (комунізм) та оунівський націоналізм, та вказує на плюралістичну демократію як єдиноправильну політично-устроєву концепцію, що на неї повинен орієнтуватися український визвольний рух. Не розумію, що тут не до вподоби д-ру Прокопові. Чейже він теж заперечує концепцію монопартійної диктатури, що була панівна в ОУН та яка ще сьогодні має серед нас численних прибічників. Коли ж д-р Прокоп відстоює позиції націоналістичних ревізійоністів з-перед сорок років, він мусів би визнати, що у своєму послідовному розвитку це повинно було довести власне до тієї концепції, що її пропонує Шумук.

Небезпека від усякої полеміки в тому, що вона надмірно загострює суперечності й тому може давати викривлене уявлення про погляди дискутантів. Я не хотів би, щоб читачі цих критичних заміток залишилися з враженням, що в мене існує намір дискредитувати табір ОУН. Такого тенденційного бажання я не мав і не маю, бо розглядаю націоналістичний рух, подібно як усі інші українські політичні та ідеологічні течії, як частину спільного історичного досвіду нашого народу. Націоналізм зробив, безсумнівно, вагомий внесок у розвиток пореволюційної України. В його доробку було теж чимало позитивного, чого я не мав можливості належно висвітлити в рамках цієї дискусії. Поряд з цим були, звичайно, велетенські помилки, що на них не сміємо запліщувати очей, якщо хочемо, щоб вони не були повторені в майбутньому. Критична перевірка історичного досвіду являє собою конечну передумову прогресу політичної думки та росту національної самосвідомості. Обмін думок між д-ром Прокопом і мною принесе користь, якщо він зверне увагу молодих колег на дану проблематику та спонукає їх зайнятися її дослідженням.

Іван Лисяк-Рудницький

REVIEWS

GEORGE GAJECKY, *THE COSSACK ADMINISTRATION OF THE HETMANATE*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1978. 2 vols.: xv, 394 pp.; x, 395 pp.

The Cossack uprising under Bohdan Khmelnytsky, which erupted in 1648, altered the sociopolitical situation in the Ukrainian lands and culminated in the creation of a new Cossack state—the Hetmanate. The old ruling elite of Polish nobles and magnates was eliminated, partly in battle, partly through flight, and those who remained lost their former influence. Their dominant role was now assumed by the Cossack estate, which took over the state administration. The territory was divided into regiments and companies, where the Cossack officers assumed the local administration. This new system of the Cossack state was unique. On the one hand it tried to satisfy all the classes of Ukrainian society; on the other it cultivated the political aim to resurrect (with the Hadiach treaty) the ancient Grand Duchy of Kiev.

George Gajecy's book provides a historical, geographic and statistical background to the Cossack state. Each chapter is devoted to one regiment (region) and begins with a brief introduction describing the geographical location, historical development, demographic characteristics, and division according to companies (counties). The main emphasis of the study is on the registers of all Cossack officers from the rank of captain to hetman. These registers are heavily documented and provided with an index of over four thousand names and an extensive bibliography of primary and secondary sources.

The book is an important pioneering work on the internal system of the Cossack state administration. It should become a basic reference work for subsequent scholars researching the internal history of the Hetmanate. Given the extensiveness of this study and the amount of work invested in it, the author is to be complimented for achieving clarity and comprehensiveness. Gajecy knows his material, and his presentation is well organized and very informative.

However, the book has some omissions that should be noted. The author is not concerned with the Cossack registers of the right-bank regiments. He enumerates only the hetmans of this region. This neglect is regrettable but not surprising, owing to the lack of published archival materials from the Ukrainian regions controlled by the Polish Crown. It is time, however, to complete the right-bank Cossack registers and to start a new serial publication of all the important Ukrainian documents in Polish archives.

In the text there are some typographical and orthographical mistakes, as well as erroneous transliterations, which confuse certain proper names published in the book. In our opinion, this kind of publication should have a carefully made and exact errata to correct all the errors in the text. Nevertheless, such omissions do not detract from the overall worth of this important contribution to Ukrainian Cossack history.

Alexander Baran
University of Manitoba

OREST SUBTELNY, *THE MAZEPISTS: UKRAINIAN SEPARATISM IN THE EARLY EIGHTEENTH CENTURY*. Boulder, Colo.: East European Monographs, 1981. Distributed by Columbia University Press. 280 pp., \$20.

Orest Subtelny has performed a major feat of historical research. His book throws light on a portion of East European history that has received little attention in Western historiography. It provides an extraordinary insight into the relationship among Peter I, Charles XII, Ivan Mazepa, and Mazepa's followers—the Mazepists.

In this scholarly, objective, and very informative work, the author acquaints the reader with the history of Ukraine in the context of the political situation in Eastern Europe at the end of the seventeenth and beginning of the eighteenth century. The question of the Ukrainian-Russian conflict initiated by Hetman Ivan Mazepa (1639-1709) was usually distorted or misrepresented throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, because the Hetman had committed an "unpardonable sin": he had tried to withdraw Ukraine from Russia. It is no wonder that "the opponents of the evolving Ukrainian national movement in the Russian empire habitually referred to Ukrainian activists as Mazepists and labeled their movement 'mazepynstvo.'" "The identification was meant to be derogatory," writes Prof. Subtelny.

Mazepa is a controversial personality in East European history not only because of his alliance with the Swedish king against the tsar, but also because he was one of the most influential figures in the emerging Russian Empire. One of the most debated issues in European historiography is the question of whether or not Mazepa had the right to abandon Peter I and to conclude a secret alliance with Charles XII. Many historians do not analyze correctly the relationship between the tsar and the hetman either because of the tendentiousness of sources or the lack of them.

Although he knew the tragic development of Ukrainian-Russian relations, Mazepa was in principle neither a Russophile nor a Russophobe. In fact, he considered coexistence with Russia possible on the basis of the Pereiaslav Agreement of 1654. This was the political reality that he

inherited from his predecessors, and it was his understanding that the *conditio sine qua non* of any Ukrainian policy was the benevolent, or at least neutral, position of the Russian government towards Ukraine.

Because of his loyalty and brilliant tactics, Mazepa was not only trusted, but also respected in Moscow. With Moscow's support, he was able to cope with the opposition of some of the Cossack officers and with social dissatisfaction with his administration. He hoped, with the help of Moscow, to consolidate the Ukrainian lands within the framework of an autonomous Ukrainian Military Republic (the Hetman state). In 1704 he recovered Right-Bank Ukraine despite attempts to annex it to the Polish crown.

When the Great Northern War began, the relations between Peter I and Mazepa were cordial. In fact, on the tsar's recommendation, Emperor Joseph I granted Mazepa the title of "Prince of the Holy Roman Empire" on 1 September 1707. Although the Ukrainian interests were very remote from the Russian ones, Mazepa served faithfully and carried out the tsar's orders.

Mazepa and the Cossack officer corps (*starshyna*) intended to maintain and defend their rights. Mazepa considered himself a faithful vassal of the tsar, who in turn was obliged to guarantee and honour the basic provisions of the agreement reached in Pereiaslav.

Despite the tsar's favours, there were serious indications that Peter I wanted to abolish the autonomy of Ukraine and to oust Mazepa from office. When the hetman requested military aid against a possible Swedish attack, the tsar expressed his refusal thus: "I can give you neither ten thousand nor even ten men. Defend yourself as best as you can" (p. 25). However, many of Mazepa's regiments were engaged in the tsar's service elsewhere, and the remaining troops were insufficient for the defense of Ukraine. Peter's refusal to defend his faithful vassal meant that he had violated the Pereiaslav Agreement—the basis of loyalty to him. Consequently, this agreement was no longer binding, because this contract was based on mutual obligation. If the vassal, who was loyal, faithful, and obedient to his lord, "had good reason to believe that his lord was breaking his obligations, he had the right—the famous *jus resistendi*—to rise against him to protect his interests. Thus, in theory, the lord as well as the vassal could be guilty of disloyalty. Throughout Europe, the contractual principle rested on the prevailing cornerstone of legal and moral authority—custom. The German *Schwabenspiegel*, one of the primary sources for customary law in East Central Europe, provided a concise summary of the principle: 'We should serve our sovereigns because they protect us, but if they will no longer defend us, then we owe them no more service' " (p. 26).

In addition, argues Prof. Subtelny, in the event that Peter I and Augustus II had won the war, the tsar would have returned Right-Bank

Ukraine to Poland, and if Charles XII and Stanisław Leszczyński had won the war, the Poles would have regained all of Ukraine. In either case, Ukraine would have been the loser. Mazepa could remain faithful to the tsar and see Ukraine invaded and plundered by the Swedish army, or he could negotiate for Swedish protection. Confronted by such a situation, Mazepa decided to establish contracts through Leszczyński with Charles XII, "so that they would not treat us as the enemy and ravage poor Ukraine with fire and sword." In fact, Mazepa's goal was to establish an independent Ukrainian state.

Mazepa was not the only one who tried to protect the rights and privileges of his country. For example, Johann Reinhold von Patkul of Livonia rebelled against the Swedish King (1697); the Transylvanian prince Ferenc II Rákóczi led an uprising against the Hapsburgs (1703-1711); Stanisław Leszczyński, representing the republican traditions of Poland and aided by the Swedes, fought against the autocratic Saxon-Polish king Augustus II; Demetrius Kantemir, hospodar of Moldavia, a vassal of the Porte, with the tsar's aid rebelled against the Sultan (1711).

After Mazepa's death, the Cossacks who had fled to Turkish territory elected his chancellor, Pylyp Orlyk (1672-1742), their new hetman and did not give up their hope of liberating Ukraine from Russia with the aid of Sweden and the Porte. The Porte, fearful of Russian expansion, joined the Swedish king in the war against the tsar. Most feasible but least popular among Mazepa's followers was the plan to establish a Ukrainian state in Right-Bank Ukraine under Ottoman protection. According to Prof. Subtelny, there were two reasons why this plan did not materialize. First, the Swedish king objected to the idea of an Ottoman protectorate. In fact, he considered Hetman Orlyk to be his vassal and forbade him to negotiate with the Porte ("The Porte is hardly willing or able to liberate your fatherland from the Muscovite yoke," p. 91). Secondly, in Orlyk's view, the Turkish protectorate was dangerous, more in the religious sense of letting the "infidel" within the Christian fold than in purely political and military terms.

In summary, writes the author, Orlyk's anti-Muslim prejudices, Ottoman unwillingness to force the issue, and the stubborn opposition of the Poles repeatedly blocked the project of creating a Ukrainian state in Right-Bank Ukraine. However, "compared to what later generations of Ukrainian émigrés were able to accomplish, Orlyk's achievements were considerable. He and his son Hryhor, general in the French army, were in close personal contact with Charles XII, Louis XIV, August II, Stanisław Leszczyński, Sultan Mahmud I, Khans Devlet and Kaplan Girei, not to mention their most important ministers and advisors," concludes the author.

There are, however, a few isolated inaccuracies. The hetman of Right-Bank Ukraine was not Ivan (p. 17), but Pavlo Teteria. Mazepa received

the newly established Order of St. Andrew not in 1702 (p. 20), but in 1700, and the Polish order "Biały Orzeł" from August II not in 1705 (p. 224), but in 1702. The hetman was granted the title of Prince of the Holy Roman Empire not in 1708 (p. 24), but in 1707. In the fall of 1705 Stanisław Leszczyński did not send a priest (p. 27), but a nobleman, Franciszek Wolski. B. Kentrzhynsky's *Mazepa* was not published in Lund in 1966 (p. 225), but in Stockholm in 1962. The author assumes that "with the help of European, especially French diplomats, whose governments were worried by Russian expansion, tensions between the Porte and Moscow were pushed to the point where, on November 19, 1710, the Divan declared war on the Tsar" (p. 72). However, the Russians claim that it was England that tried its best to weaken Russia by contributing in 1700 to the Porte. The earlier assumption that this war was the result of French intrigues, as S. M. Soloviev maintained, is outdated.¹ These are minor points, however.

Prof. Subtelny's research on the subject has been accurate and perceptive, and this book is a great contribution to Ukrainian scholarship of the period. The author has examined a large volume of literature, much of it in the archives of Poland, France, and Vienna, and his treatment reveals an unusual familiarity with the sources in several languages. One should be grateful to the author for systematically recording the material, some of it difficult to come by, and for publishing the texts of several documents.

Finally, it should be said that Orest Subtelny has been able to achieve both depth and interest for the professional as well as nonprofessional reader.

Theodore Mackiw
University of Akron

FAN PARKER AND STEPHEN JAN PARKER, *RUSSIA ON CANVAS: ILYA REPIN*. University Park, Pa. and London: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1980. xiii, 178 pp.

Of the many books written about Repin, this one is not the best. As an English-language publication (the first of its kind by Western scholars), *Russia on Canvas*, written jointly by Fan and Stephen Parker, had the potential of reaching a wide audience of non-Russian readers and to provide them with a wealth of information about Repin. While the

¹ Leonid N. Nikiforov, *Russko-angliiskie otnoshenia pri Petre I* (Moscow, 1950), pp. 86-87. Cf. Ilse Jacob, "Beziehungen Englands zu Russland und Tuerkei in den Jahren 1718-1727" (Ph.D. diss., University of Basel, 1945), p. 35.

book synthesizes much of the valuable data available about Repin in other languages (which, in itself, renders a great service to those who know next to nothing about Repin or his ambience), in conception, it is faulty on two major counts: (1) Repin seems *really* not to be the subject of this book; and (2) the title, "Russia on Canvas," seems somewhat inconsistent with the actual content.

If this book is at odds with its title, then what is it about? The Parkers have, in essence, created a journalistic, popularized account of Russian cultural history. Their book is filled with the names of individuals, mainly writers, who have long been memorialized for their works or deeds: Mussorgsky, Stasov, Tolstoy, Tretiakov, Turgenev, and so on. In an attempt to fill in a spotty chronology of Repin's biography, the authors saturate their narrative with chitchatty details of the artist's familial problems, his lack of social graces, his loves, and conflicts with others—all of which is fascinating gossip, but hardly serves as data to substantiate his contribution to the history of art.

At times a patronizing attitude emerges on the part of the authors as their popularized history turns into a travelogue of an episodic nature, punctuated by anecdote or melodramatic reportage. This results in a text that is uneven and loosely organized. The authors incessantly lose focus of Repin, dwelling instead on other issues, and then clumsily rework him into the narrative. Over and over again the reader is entertained but becomes increasingly confused as to the authors' intentions. All in all, the authors fail to meet their stated objective: "to write of Repin as he himself perceived his life in the social and political violence of his time" (p. 2). On this count, they disappoint their reader by not having drawn more heavily on Repin's diaries, correspondence, and notes not yet published. With only a few exceptions, the authors have relied solely on secondary sources, for the most part published after 1945. Although the Parkers admit to having had traveled to the Soviet Union specifically to do research on this topic, there is regrettably little evidence of a new insight into Repin. The inherent drama of Repin's individual paintings, which beg for explanation and clarification, is untouched. Little is mentioned about the manner of painting or Repin's changing style, least of all his iconography. In a word, the authors have made a poor attempt at penetrating the works of one of the great masters of Slavic art in the modern world. One wonders if the problem does not arise from their initial misunderstanding of this art, since they claim that Repin was "a realist and not a modernist" (p. 1). The premise is faulty, for realism *is* modernism in the context of Slavic art, and Western criteria do not apply.

Repin traveled extensively throughout Western Europe, which accounts, in part, for his "modernist" attitude toward art. These trips are described in detail by the Parkers, yet they fail to dwell on the impact

of Parisian and other Western artistic circles on Repin's art, directly or indirectly. In the same way, they fail to speculate on the significance of Repin's more than frequent visits to his birthplace, Chuhuiv, in Ukraine. Indeed, Repin's psyche was not all that homogeneous with the matrix of the artistic circles of Russia. Repin himself claimed that Saint Petersburg was only his "intellectual fatherland," but that his soul originated in Ukraine. Long before he affiliated himself with the Wanderers (*Peredvizhniki*), Repin already found inspiration in the daily life of the common folk in the Chuhuiv region. His subject matter stemmed from the current problems that beset these people: the return of soldiers from the war, the gathering of new recruits, the village school, religious processions, and so on. In approaching painting from a deep psychological basis, he addressed universal issues, and the content of his canvases was not strictly Russian. Several of his paintings were specifically generated by Ukrainian folklore and history, for example, *Vechornitsy*, *Zaporozhian Cossacks Writing a Letter to the Turkish Sultan*, *Portrait of T. Shevchenko*, *Haidamaks at Uman*.

That Repin drew much of his artistic inspiration from Ukraine is an undeniable fact and one that is acknowledged by anyone who does research on the master. Except for a few general attempts (P. I. Hovdia and O. M. Kovalenko, *Peredvizhnyky i Ukraina* [Kiev, 1978]; *Repin i Ukraina: Pisma deiatelei ukrainskoi kultury i iskusstva k Repinu 1896-1927* [Kiev, 1962], the issue has not yet been fully examined in any serious study. In any case, the Parkers have confounded the problem considerably. As they introduce background material, they superficially gloss over history, repeating conventional nineteenth-century Russian historiography and confusing Russia with Ukraine. Their presentation is cursory, oversimplified, and filled with misconceptions, which makes it impossible to understand a painting such as the *Cossacks*. Sweeping, unqualified statements detract from the book and cause us to read it with great caution and discretion. More often than not, sources are not given for important facts; others are poorly documented. An explanation of the Zaporozhian Sich, which is germane to the painting, is relegated to a single sentence in the footnotes (p. 143, n. 13).

This review is not an attempt at underestimating the skills of the authors. In many instances, the footnotes provide valuable and meaningful information, such as the story behind the restoration of the vandalized painting of *Ivan the Terrible and His Son* (p. 142, n. 12) or the compilation of Tolstoy paintings (pp. 143-44, n. 19). Of the appendices, the most appropriate and useful is the list of "Some Works by Repin in American Collections." Even though only seven works are included here, the list is a welcome contribution. There are, moreover, a number of good points to be noted concerning the actual text. East-West attitudes toward art are deftly discussed in the last chapter; the chapter on Paris is also

relevant in this light, as is the chapter on Saint Petersburg, which exposes the life of an artist in the Academy of Art. In general, Stasov's magnanimous role and influence in introducing a national school to Russian art is also communicated well. Yet, throughout most of the text, Repin is often put in the position of a secondary figure, only rubbing shoulders with major personalities. Repin's importance seems negligible as we read about the achievements of others. Using Repin as a kind of pretense for their narrative, the Parkers teach us much more about the soirées at Abramtsevo, Penaty and Iasnaia Poliana. In the end, all of this proves to be a digression, and what results is neither biography nor art history. The Parkers have produced a book that transmits a feeling, an atmosphere surrounding a particularly tightly knit group of people at a particular time in history. Though the text may satisfy enthusiasts of popular cultural history, through it Repin's contribution in the history of art has been greatly diminished.

Myroslava M. Mudrak
Ohio State University

FYLYMON TARNAVSKY, *SPOHADY: RODYNNA KHRONIKA TARNAVSKYKH IAK PRYCHYNOK DO ISTORII TSEKOVNYKH, SVIA-SHCHENYTSKYKH, POBUTOVYKH, EKONOMICHNYKH I POLITYCHNYKH VIDNOSYN U HALYCHYNI V DRUHII POLOVYNI XIX STORICHCHIA I V PERSHII DEKADI XX STORICHCHIA*, ed. Anatol Mariia Bazylevych and Roman Ivan Danylevych. Toronto: Dobra Knyzhka, 1981. 266 pp.

The memoirs of the Greek Catholic pastor Fylymon Tarnavsky (Filimon Tarnawsky) not only make engrossing reading, but are a valuable source on Ukrainian life in Galicia during the Austrian constitutional era. A priest's son, Tarnavsky was born in 1862 and studied at the First Academic Gymnasium in Lviv and at Lviv University. He was ordained in 1889 and, as a convinced populist, combined his strictly pastoral work with intense activity to educate and raise the national consciousness of the peasants in his parishes (Iaseniv, Chystopady, Manaiv). He never achieved political or cultural prominence in Galicia, but he was one of those numerous clergymen who served as the loyal foot soldiers of the Ukrainian national movement. He was not without a sense of humour, enjoyed a good meal, and entertained a grand passion for hunting. Most importantly, he was curious and sharp, a fine observer with an excellent memory, and a skilful raconteur. He emigrated to America in 1911. He wrote his memoirs on Galicia in Hot Springs, Arkansas, in 1931, by which time he had become a monarchist. He died in 1948. Fortunately, his family preserved and ultimately decided to publish his memoirs as an act of filial homage.

Tarnavsky's memoirs are especially useful for insights into the social history of the Galician clergy. They are superior to Father Oleksii Zaklynsky's memoirs of a somewhat earlier period (*Zapysky parokha Starykh Bohorodchan*, 2nd ed. [Toronto: Dobra Knyzhka, 1960]). From Tarnavsky's digressions on his and others' genealogy and kinship, we can see what a close-knit, endogamous elite the clergy formed. We can also observe the gradual re-Ukrainization of the priesthood in the mid-nineteenth century after decades of Polonization (pp. 19-25), the absence of a religious atmosphere in most clerical families (pp. 80-81) and the growth of radicalism among priests' children in the late nineteenth century (pp. 16-17, 85). Through conversations with older priests, Tarnavsky also learned about earlier historic moments for the Greek Catholic clergy, such as when educated priests, beneficiaries of the Josephine reforms, began to replace the traditional, uneducated clergy in the early nineteenth century (pp. 34-35). The story of Tarnavsky's first years after ordination provide an understanding of the material problems facing a young Galician priest. Even such a detail as that his mother married at the age of fourteen (p. 20) is not without interest to the social historian. But the real highlight of the memoirs is the vivid account of how an activist priest preached the national gospel in a village, fought against the tavern, campaigned in elections, and established reading clubs and cooperative stores—all in spite of unrelenting opposition from landlords, tavern-keepers, local government officials, and conservative peasants (esp. pp. 141-51, 168-87).

The awakening of the Galician village comes to life in these pages, the struggles between Jews and Ukrainians, landlords and peasants, village elites and reform-minded peasant youth. Tarnavsky also observed first-hand and described the curious phenomenon of naive tsarism among Ukrainian peasants in Austria, their apparently irrational adoration of the Russian tsar (pp. 52-54; for an explanation and description of the phenomenon, see my "Hope in the Tsar: Displaced Naive Monarchism among the Ukrainian Peasants of the Habsburg Empire," *Russian History* 7, pts. 1-2 [1980]: 125-38). The memoirs abound with lifelike character sketches—of the old *khrun* (literally "oinker"; a peasant who sided with the landlord) and of the new peasant burning with ardour for the national movement—and eloquent incidents: a tavern-keeper threatening a schoolteacher (Tarnavsky himself, before ordination) for reading Prosvita booklets to the villagers (p. 108); or a peasant refusing to contribute to a cooperative store because "you need a Jew's head for such business, not a peasant's" (pp. 174-75). The only aspect of the village awakening missing in Tarnavsky's account is the confrontation between priests and radicals, which Tarnavsky claims never to have experienced first-hand (p. 218).

In addition to the intoxicating panorama of the Galician village,

Tarnavsky's memoirs also contain noteworthy material on other aspects of Galicia's history in the constitutional era. Particularly well done are descriptions of personalities. Tarnavsky knew the young Kyrylo Trylovsky and the aging Kornel Ujejski; his memoirs contain a priceless portrait of Oleksii Paliukh, leading Russophile and director of the Narodnii Dim in Lviv (pp. 49-50). There is a fascinating description of Metropolitan Andrei Sheptytsky searching through a mouse-besieged, collapsing choir loft, hoping to turn up an item of interest for his church museum (pp. 188-90). The memoirs also reveal hitherto unknown information about Ivan Franko's radical agitation at Lviv's Ukrainian gymnasium in the late 1870s; Tarnavsky himself attended a meeting then of a secret radical student club (headed by the son of the eminent Russophile, Father Ivan Naumovych!) at which Franko spoke on Darwinism (pp. 85-86). The famous, or infamous, "new era" (a short-lived political rapprochement between the Polish nobility and Ukrainian national populists) is also treated in the memoirs; Tarnavsky informs us of the tremendous difficulties this volte-face caused for national populist activists in the village, especially loss of the peasantry's confidence, which had been won slowly and with difficulty.

The memoirs were edited by Tarnavsky's grandson, Anatol Maria Bazylewycz, and by Roman Iwan Danylewycz after Bazylewycz's death. The volume includes appendices on other members of the family, who have no relation to the story Tarnavsky was telling, as well as irrelevant snapshots from the family album (on p. 122: "Omelian Tarnavsky on the Italian front [1916] with the little dog that saved his life.") Many of the notes are only a sounding board for the opinionated Danylewycz; see, for example, his long note on pp. 93-94 in praise of a married clergy (an argument with the married Father Tarnavsky, who had been an advocate of celibacy). Still, the editors did spruce up Tarnavsky's style and render his language literary (see p. 174, where a sentence from Tarnavsky's original is quoted); one wonders, however, whether such linguistic editing was wise, since it is generally best to leave sources with their original linguistic flavour intact. Tarnavsky's great-granddaughter, Khrystia Iuliia Bazylevych, compiled a useful index, which, however, is neither complete (for example, p. 72 mentions a Father Rozdilsky, who does not figure in the index) nor professional (for example, she did not know the first name of the famous Galician radical and friend of Franko, Mykhailo Pavlyk). But whatever the deficiencies of the editing, we should be grateful to the family for bringing Tarnavsky's memoirs to light.

This is a truly enjoyable and valuable book on Ukrainian Galicia from the 1860s to the eve of the First World War.

John-Paul Himka
University of Alberta

RICHARD PIPES, *STRUVE: LIBERAL ON THE RIGHT, 1905-1944*, Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press, 1980. xix, 526 pp.

After Mykhailo Hrushevsky returned to Russia in 1914, the tsarist government exiled him to Simbirsk. At that time, Peter Struve rose to his defence in Saint Petersburg. Many years later Hrushevsky repaid Struve by referring to him as "that reactionary rascal." Although Hrushevsky's epithet was one of the milder insults that Struve endured, it nevertheless reflected Struve's historical reputation after 1905. In this second biographical volume, Richard Pipes's intention is not to change that reputation, but to explain it in the context of the history of the Russian intelligentsia in the first half of the twentieth century. Granted, after the revolution we see little of the intelligentsia that remained under Soviet power; instead we join the exiled generation.

Before 1905 Struve had been a "liberal on the left," as Pipes had titled his earlier volume a decade ago. As a scholar and activist, Struve had helped to found the Marxist movement in Russia, initiated Marxist revisionism there, and then went on to be a cofounder and theoretician of the liberal Constitutional Democratic Party, the so-called "Kadets." In this period the main enemy for Struve was the intransigent tsarist autocracy, which had to be forced to share political life with its subjects.

During the 1905 Revolution, however, Struve began to doubt whether his country, that is, both the intelligentsia and the masses, really could take advantage of the opportunities that the October Manifesto, with its inclination towards liberalization, had presented. Although he remained highly critical of reaction on the government's side, Struve came to the idea that the Russian intelligentsia had failed to grasp the significance of the changes and events wrought by the revolution; as a result the intelligentsia's failure to adjust its mind-set and political behaviour threatened to negate the hard-won reforms of the Manifesto and the Fundamental Laws. Struve's belief that the intelligentsia had to undergo a fundamental spiritual restructuring became the basis for the *Vekhi* (Signposts) school, and it remained part of his historical philosophy to the end.

Although his activity took many forms, some without apparent purpose or success, it nevertheless had an inner coherence. Since Struve's criterion was not so much wordly success as spiritual self-perfection, he could remain buoyed as long as he did. Except for a brief moment as an elected Kadet deputy to the Second Duma, Struve held no official position. Yet he emerged as one of the leading spokesmen of a body of Russian public opinion that Pipes calls "national liberal." These people espoused a conservative liberalism that stressed strong authority, gradualist reform, legality, and a vigorous foreign policy.

As with many of Struve's views, his Russian nationalist sentiments only added to a growingly popular estimation that he was an inopportune thorn for the Kadets. Struve's "blind spot," as Pipes phrases it, was Ukraine. Not only did he stubbornly refuse to acknowledge the political aspirations of the recently emerging conscious Ukrainian nationality, but he also denied the existence of a distinct Ukrainian culture. While this particular belief may appear grounded in mere ignorance or prejudice, it was still consistent with Struve's characteristically extreme intellectual honesty and personal integrity. If Struve had any weakness aside from inflexible principles, it was that of excessive optimism and doctrinairism. He overestimated the abilities of the tsarist government and of the opposition parties to compromise on a new political system for the Russian Empire. He equally underestimated the viability of the Bolshevik regime to survive both militarily and politically.

Struve wore many hats during his long and fascinating career. Pipes devotes sufficient attention to each of Struve's undertakings in order to provide us with a complete portrait of this remarkable individual. Pipes has painstakingly waded through all of Struve's known available writings (the facsimile *Collected Works* [Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1970] fill fifteen volumes) and has produced here digestable chapters on Struve's economic and philosophic labours. Indeed, it was in keeping with his character that Struve would retreat into pure scholarship whenever he became disillusioned with or unable to engage in political activity. Interestingly enough, Pipes takes exception with what most of Struve's supporters would have considered to have been Struve's main craft—an historian. Pipes the historian argues that

Struve lacked the true historian's ability to organize vast quantities of material into a coherent whole. Immensely erudite as it is, the corpus of his historical writings presents neither an original nor a consistent interpretation of Russian history, and can only be described as an agglomeration of fragments of uneven quality.

Pipes reminds the reader that because of this inability to concentrate on any subject long enough to master it, Struve's writings usually took the form of reactions to specific events or to polemical responses to him. Consequently, his true profession was that of a publicist, though an unusually precocious one.

If anything is missing from this study, it is a reflection on the ultimately tragic fate of the émigré, who seems destined to historical irrelevance. In Peter Bergardovich Struve we see another signpost pointing to the isolation of the Russian intelligentsia at home and abroad from a society that ignored and destroyed those who tried to teach it how to grow.

Konstantin Huytan
Ottawa

HRYPHORII KOSTIUK, *VOLODYMYR VYNNYCHENKO TA IOHO DOBA: DOSLIDZHENNIA, KRYTYKA, POLEMIKA*. New York: Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S., 1980. 283 pp.

What one is most struck by after reading Hryhorii Kostiuk's book is the wealth of information that unfolds before the reader of this unique volume. Yet, in his introduction Mr. Kostiuk clearly indicates that the material thus far published on Volodymyr Vynnychenko represents only the first embryonic steps in the analysis and criticism of this controversial Ukrainian writer and political figure.

Mr. Kostiuk begins his book by enumerating the most essential problems or areas of study connected with the critical examination of Vynnychenko: (1) the biographical aspect, which is essential to the understanding of Vynnychenko's works; (2) the historical-literary aspect, which would cover Vynnychenko's relationship (personal and literary) with such world-renowned literary figures as Gorky, Dostoevsky, Chekhov, Maeterlinck, and D'Annunzio; since Vynnychenko's dramas were seen and appraised throughout Europe, a comparative approach to his works would seem most critical; (3) the purely literary aspect of Vynnychenko's works, with special emphasis on his contribution to Ukrainian literature. As Mr. Kostiuk points out, there has been a dramatic absence of solid, intelligent criticism of Vynnychenko's work owing to the abnormal conditions in the development of Ukrainian literary criticism, as well as the nature of Vynnychenko's themes. These themes are characterized by a passionate concern for social issues, and a uniquely individual, modern approach to problems of morality, family relationships, marital relations, love, hate, truth, dishonesty, honour, contradictions and hypocrisy in sexual behaviour, parenthood, and so on; in essence, by "an uncompromising depiction of humanity with its spiritual and psychological complexities, divine and demonic, human and bestial facets" (p. 19); (4) the philosophical-ethical aspect, that is, the far-ranging influences (Buddhism, Christianity, Marx) that would provide an enhanced understanding of Vynnychenko as a person and writer; and finally (5) the social-political aspect of Vynnychenko's life, which provoked as much, if not more, controversy than his literary endeavours.

The remaining chapters of this informative book treat such varied yet integrally related subjects as analyses of specific literary works; a detailed description of Vynnychenko's final residence in the village of Mougins, France; Vynnychenko's relationship with such Ukrainian personalities as Lesia Ukrainka and Serhii Iefremov; Vynnychenko as an artist; Vynnychenko's forty-year diary; his controversial mission to Moscow and Kharkiv in 1920; an analysis of Vynnychenko criticism in the Soviet Union and abroad; and finally, other materials and documents pertaining to the study of this prolific Ukrainian writer and activist.

Journal

In one of the most revealing chapters, Mr. Kostiuk describes the nature and content of Vynnychenko's diary, which was begun in 1911 and was continued until the author's death in 1951. From the diary there is the following quotation: "I decided to carry on a consistent if not daily pattern of writing in my journal. This practice induces self-analysis and self-organization. It forces one to reflect upon oneself. A journal provides a means of focusing in on life—which is essential for happiness. The mind is capable of focusing all of one's essence upon life's significant moments, to examine and illuminate them as with an electric light: in this way, the mind is a great ally of happiness" (pp. 185-86). It is clear that self-examination was critical to Vynnychenko's quest for solutions to the problems that impede human happiness.

Upon reading this book, one must come to the conclusion that Mr. Kostiuk has devoted much time and effort to the discovery and analysis of Vynnychenko. He has taken time to become acquainted with Vynnychenko's patriotic, social, literary, and spiritual aspirations. Vynnychenko possessed a volatile personality that could equally inspire love or hate, and he was often subject to irrational criticism of his life and work. Yet, he was a man who dearly loved his native land and strove to unlock the secrets of universal human harmony. He came to the realization that he could only begin from himself and his own method of living. He suffered much in the process of his discoveries, many of which were made through his literary work—a kind of mental laboratory in which he would examine new hypotheses concerning the human condition. Mr. Kostiuk, without sentimentality or unscrutinized devotion, has provided us with a most insightful look into Volodymyr Vynnychenko, his life and times. This book should provide great incentive to students of Ukrainian literature, as well as to those whose minds have not yet been closed to new possibilities, to further their knowledge of a most fascinating subject.

Melanie Pytlowany-Kordiuk
University of Toronto

GEORGE G. GRABOWICZ, *THE POET AS MYTHMAKER: A STUDY OF SYMBOLIC MEANING IN TARAS ŠEVČENKO*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1982. x, 170 pp. Dist. Harvard University Press.

This is an important book, which may become a landmark in Shevchenko studies. Whether it does so will depend on the kind of impact it will leave on scholars in the field. Even if the book were translated into Ukrainian, as it should be, the influence on Ukraine, in the present circumstances, would be negligible. It remains to be seen whether students of Shevchenko

in the diaspora are any more ready to be receptive to Grabowicz's radically new analysis. It is radically new not only because it uses structural anthropology and applies it to the symbolic meaning of Shevchenko's poetry, but also because in doing so, it destroys the traditional approaches to Shevchenko. The author's plunge into hitherto uncharted waters is most refreshing, for what he brings to the surface is a compelling view of Shevchenko's poetics, or, as Grabowicz would prefer to put it, mythopoesis. For this alone he deserves our thanks, but even more so for exposing in the process the old conventional views of the poet for what they often are—reductionist and simplistic.

The central section of the study, contained in chapter three, defines myth and analyses its manifestations in Shevchenko's work. Perhaps the greatest discovery here is the juxtaposition and tension between what Grabowicz calls Shevchenko's concepts of "communitas" and "structure." *Communitas* is not only present as "a pious goal" or "an ideal, hoped-for state of egalitarian unity," but is shown as being constantly victimized. Its opposite, *structure*, is "the world of authority and rank, of law and order," which the poet always views negatively. The peasant ethos and the Cossack state are also part of structure. It is not just the simple juxtaposition between "communitas" and "structure" but "the symbolically coded movement between them" and the reaffirmation of the former over the latter that occupies Grabowicz. His perceptive discussion leads him to argue that the current images of Shevchenko as a "revolutionary democrat" (Soviet) and a prophet of a Ukrainian state (*émigré*) are fallacious. "Translated and reduced to the language of political ideology," writes Grabowicz, "[Shevchenko's imaginative universe] would constitute a radical anti-statist populism or indeed anarchism."

It would be a disservice to concentrate on these conclusions alone, for the chief merit of the study lies elsewhere—in the unfolding of Shevchenko's mythical symbolism. It is done with great skill, indeed with erudition. But what are the unanswered questions that Grabowicz's study posits? What are the flaws and imperfections? The greatest, to my mind, is the isolation in which Shevchenko is viewed by Grabowicz. Of course, every poet's vision is unique, but not to such an extent that he can be isolated from his contemporaries or from the ambience in which he lives. Shevchenko's Ukrainian, Polish, and Russian contemporaries are rarely mentioned, and then only to underline his uniqueness. Kulish, for example, is seen as the opposite of Shevchenko, "his rival and self-appointed exegete." Although this was the role Kulish played to the hilt after Shevchenko's death, the links between his and Shevchenko's Romanticism and "nativism" are very strong. Even Kulish's poetic vision owes a great deal to Shevchenko. While Gogol's and Słowacki's views of the Cossack world were different from Shevchenko's, their search for "communitas" was everpresent. The "millenarian vision" of Shevchenko is not unique among

the Romantics. The dialectic opposition in Shevchenko is, for that matter, characteristic of most Western European Romantics. But we find no mention of Blake or Coleridge. Perhaps in a book of 170 pages there was no room for this larger perspective, but it is a serious omission, which leads us to view Shevchenko as somewhat of a freak. Secondly, Grabowicz's Shevchenko is also a bit of a simpleton when it comes to knowledge of Ukrainian history. Drahomanov had argued earlier that Shevchenko was ignorant of history, but later scholarship corrected this view. Is it not, therefore, dangerous to reduce Shevchenko's historico-philosophical poems to deep structures alone?

Finally, the deep structures in Shevchenko's poetry should be related to the psychological view of symbols as mediating between consciousness and the archetypes of the collective unconscious. This is what Grabowicz hints at when he acknowledges that Shevchenko was a religious poet. It is religion that, according to Jung, "has established the cycle of energy in a concrete way by means of ritual communion with the gods." There is, indeed, a great deal to be added to the present study, but further exploration will be easier now that Grabowicz has produced a key to unlock many new doors.

George S. N. Luckyj
University of Toronto

MYROSLAV PROKOP, *UKRAINA I UKRAINSKA POLITYKA MOSKVI. CHASTYNA I: PERIOD PIDHOTOVY DO DRUHOI SVITOVOI VIINY*. Second printing. N.p.: Suchasnist, 1981. 176 pp.

Myroslav Prokop's concise and valuable treatment of the period from 1917 to 1941 was initially published a quarter of a century ago and has earned a well-deserved reputation as a classic on this crucial period in Ukrainian history. The publication of a new edition of this long out-of-print work deserves a word of gratitude from all who are interested in modern Ukrainian history.

When reviewing a reprint, the central question becomes how the work has stood the test of time. In this case the answer is: surprisingly well. The criticisms that can be made stem primarily from the period in which the author wrote. Almost anyone writing at that time would have done certain things that we today consider questionable, but few could have produced a work still so well respected after two and a half decades.

Given the author's past as a Western Ukrainian active in the OUN(B), it is hardly surprising that his book shows a far greater depth of analysis when dealing with his home terrain. Here the reader is given a good deal of sociological background material, and the controversial questions of Sovietophilism in the 1920s and the OUN split of the 1930s are pre-

sented more fairly than one would expect of one who was once an active participant in what were then considered matters of life and death. When dealing with Soviet Ukraine, the author was far less concerned with subtleties and tended to portray the entire period as one of Russian oppression and Ukrainian resistance. This led him to give short shrift to the national communists of the 1920s and to assume that the Union for the Liberation of Ukraine (SVU) actually existed in the form in which it was portrayed during the show trial of 1930. A quarter of a century ago, these were both articles of faith, but today we are far less willing to accept them uncritically. After all, the ultimate suppression of national communism does not negate the fact that many of its adherents were sincere in their beliefs, while the long-term existence of a widespread conspiracy such as that portrayed during the SVU trial seems incredible to anyone familiar with the degree to which Soviet Ukrainian society was penetrated by GPU secret collaborators in the late twenties. The editors might have indicated by means of editorial notes that what were once taken as articles of faith are a bit more controversial today, but they were wise to avoid the temptation to tamper with the original text in any way.

While the publication of reprints cannot substitute for new and original works, one can only hope that Suchasnist will continue to make available to the contemporary reader more books, such as this one, that are today difficult to obtain and deserve a new generation of readers.

James E. Mace
Harvard University

OSTAP VYSHNIA, *HARD TIMES: A COLLECTION OF SATIRE AND HUMOUR*. Translated from the Ukrainian by Yuri Tkach. Doncaster, Australia: Bayda Books, 1981. 181 pp.

Hard Times is a collection of forty-eight of Ostap Vyshnia's feuilletons translated into English by Yuri Tkach. The small paperback volume is handsomely designed and printed, and it includes a brief preface by the translator, a small glossary, and a caricature of Vyshnia by Oleksander Dovzhenko.

According to Soviet editors, Vyshnia's total output consists of over 2,500 titles. Obviously, a selection that allows for only two percent of this immense oeuvre will involve some very difficult decisions. It would be easy to quibble over many of Tkach's choices, but on the whole his selection is a good one. He includes pieces from as early as 1922 and as late as 1955. Appropriately, the earlier period of Vyshnia's career is given much greater attention. Tkach includes such exemplary works as "My

Autobiography" (in the original version), "Market Day" ("Iarmarok"), and "Blue Fen: (A Caricature of Mykola Khvylovy's novel)." Regrettably missing is the well-known "Chukhraiynsi." Tkach also does well to include examples of Vyshnia's various subjects, styles, and genres. He includes both the standard "*Usmishky*" and the shorter "*Rapiashky*," although he does not make this distinction. He provides satire, parody, and anecdote. The subjects encompass the city, the village, seaside vacations, foreign holidays, politics, and social problems. Absent only are the friendly portraits of well-known personalities. Of these, "Iosyp Hirniak" or "Oleksander Dovzhenko" would have been a welcome addition.

Despite these virtues, however, *Hard Times* cannot be judged a total success. While the volume shall and should be acquired by many libraries with significant Ukrainian holdings, it is not likely to satisfy either the general reading public or the student of Ukrainian language and literature who needs English translations. In both accuracy and fluidity Tkach's translation fails to meet reasonable standards. The problem, however, is not one of simple mistakes. Although Tkach occasionally errs, as when he renders "*chudove lytse*" as "magical face" (p. 96) or "*mushka*" as "small black patch" (p. 95, rather than "beauty mark"), these errors are infrequent and insignificant. It is not the literal meaning but rather the text itself that Tkach fails to reproduce.

Translations are, at best, a compromise, but the object is always to reproduce the original text, not to improve it or simplify it. In other words, it may be pardonable, for obvious reasons, to alter the following dialogue in a translation, but the alteration should, at a minimum, attempt to preserve its overall sense and significance:

- А як по-українському "нос"?
- Ніс.
- Ніс?! Переробили "О" на "І" та й думають, що вже й інша мова. Краще вже "вухо"!
- Пишіть — "вухо"!
- ...Це — перекладач...

Tkach's version not only loses the political and editorial significance of the joke; it also makes the conversation appear illogical and unmotivated:

- "This Ukrainian language is a killer. You just change a few letters about in the Russian and whacko—you've got a new language."
- "Shut up and get on with it!"
- ... the translator at work ... (p. 126)

An even larger problem appears on the next page. Part of the humour in the conversation between the publisher and his colleague depends on a pun on the word "*vypuskovyi*." Tkach not only ignores this pun, but

confuses the reader completely by deleting a sentence and ascribing the remaining lines to the wrong speaker.

As if this were not enough, the feuilleton from which these two examples are taken is marred further by arbitrary surgery. Tkach's version omits three of the original's eleven parts. To round out the picture, we may add that the translation lacks the subtitle and fails to indicate, here as throughout, that half of sections one and four and all of section seven are deliberately in Russian rather than in Ukrainian. This last feature was a hallmark of Vyshnia's early style.

The examples cited above are not unique; indeed they are not even rare. "Blue Fen" and "Crimean Night" undergo major surgery. "Market Day" and "Travelling Abroad," among others, have smaller deletions. Minor deletions and abbreviations are frequent. While the purpose of these and other alterations is to make the text more comprehensible to a non-Ukrainian reader, they result in a severe injustice to Vyshnia's text. The following passage offers a typical example:

Ви знаєте, що таке ставок?

Це така велика, велика глибока в землі тарілка, а в ній не „Supe a la peisanne" (так у "Ренесансі" пишуть), а вода.

Tkach reduces this to:

Know what a lake is?

It's a very large deep bowl in the earth filled with water. (p. 89)

Most of the sense is still here, but none of the texture. The outrageous negative analogy ("filled, not with [misspelled French] soup but rather with..."), which Tkach omits, is a vital element of the text. Articles and monographs on Vyshnia's humour have often pointed to the centrality of such devices. The further elimination of sequential numeration and tabular format for the enumerated lists in the next two paragraphs similarly damages the original text.

In addition to these and many other inaccuracies, Tkach's translation also suffers from bad and awkward English. He offers, for example, "back to front" (p. 135) for "*navpaky*," rather than the usual "backwards"; "cabarets cater... for foreigners" (p. 141) instead of "to" foreigners; "Horatio" (p. 157) instead of "Horace"; "sacred remains" (p. 157) instead of "relics"; and, in his own preface, "dialectical" (p. 7) instead of "dialectal." Furthermore, the expressions "and etc." (p. 89) and "Venuses of Milos" contain ungrammatical redundancies.

In summary then, *Hard Times* does not, as Tkach had hoped, disprove "those literary critics who maintain that Ostap Vyshnia is impossible to translate into any non-Slavic language" (p. 7). This is not to say, however, that the task is impossible. Non-Slavic translations of Vyshnia already exist, and a good English translation could perhaps be made—but

not by Yuri Tkach. Tkach's considerable energy and skill is misapplied here. A non-belletristic application would, perhaps, be more successful. It seems likely that Tkach could produce a reasonably good translation of Iosyp Hirniak's recently published memoirs. With some editorial annotation Bayda Books would have in hand an interesting and useful offering for the English-reading public that might be inclined to learn about Ukrainian and Soviet cultural affairs, particularly the theatre, but also about such personalities as Ostap Vyshnia, whom Hirniak knew not only in the 1920s but also in Stalin's camps beyond the Arctic Circle.

Maxim Tarnawsky
Harvard University

SLOVNYK UKRAJINS'KOJI MOVY, 11 vols. Editor in chief: I. K. Bilodid. Kiev: Naukova dumka, 1970-80.*

Unlike the nineteenth- and twentieth-century bilingual dictionaries¹ on which it drew for its sources, this new Ukrainian academy of sciences dictionary is the first Ukrainian dictionary, covering Ukrainian vocabulary from the end of the eighteenth century to the present, to give meanings in Ukrainian. As such, it is the first of its kind in the history of Ukrainian lexicography. In addition to previous dictionaries, the dictionary also

* This review employs the international linguistic form of transliteration.

¹ These bilingual dictionaries are: (1) the manuscript copy of the Ukrainian-Russian *Slovnýk ukrajins'koji movy* by P. Bilec'kyj-Nosenko of the 1830s and 1840s, not published until 1966 in Kiev by the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR under the editorship of V. Nimčuk; (2) the Ukrainian-German *Ruthenisch-deutsches Wörterbuch* by E. Žellexivs'kyj and S. Nedil's'kyj (Lviv, 1886); (3) the four-volume Ukrainian-Russian *Slovar' ukrajins'koji movy* by B. Hrinčenko (Kiev, 1907-09); (4) the Soviet Russian-Ukrainian *Rosijs'ko-ukrajins'kyj slovnýk* by M. Kalynovyč, L. Bulaxovs'kyj, and M. Ryl's'kyj (Kiev, 1948); and (5) the six-volume Ukrainian-Russian *Ukrainsko-russkij slovar'* under the general editorship of I. Kyryčenko (Kiev, 1953-63). In addition, for its sources the new dictionary has made use of the two-volume Ukrainian *Slovnýk movy Ševčenko* (Dictionary of Shevchenko's Language) (Kiev, 1964), as well as of a series of bilingual dictionaries (unnamed in the preface) devoted to specific scientific disciplines, of which so many appeared in the 1950s and 1960s, e.g., the Russian-Ukrainian geological (S. Holovaščuk, 1959), mathematical (F. Hudymenko, 1960) and chemical (Je. Nekrjač, 1959) dictionaries, to mention just a few. For others, see P. Pljušč, *Istorija ukrajins'koji literaturnoji movy* (Kiev, 1971), pp. 405-6.

drew its lexical items and examples from belles lettres, folklore, general and popular works and periodicals, and scholarly, socioeconomic, and scientific literature of a not too specialized nature. Since the shortcomings of the belletristic, political, scientific, and scholarly sources used by the dictionary have already been noted by Bohdan Strumins'kyj, who reviewed the dictionary when only six volumes had appeared,² this information will not be repeated here. It must be noted, however, that although Bilodid and his associates have added additional sources in volumes seven and eleven, none of these negate the validity of Strumins'kyj's critical assessment of the one-sidedness of the sources used in the academy dictionary. Despite Strumins'kyj's protest, the additions in volume seven and eleven all remain Soviet, with the exception of Hrinčenko's dictionary, which, although mentioned in the editorial preface, does not appear among the sources in volume one and hence had to be added in volume seven.

This one-sidedness can be seen not only in the choice of sources, but also in the meanings of the lexical items themselves, which reflect a general pro-Soviet tendentiousness coupled with a distortion of Ukrainian traditions that goes hand in hand with a strong anti-religious bias. In short, the academy dictionary is a vehicle of Soviet Russian propaganda, which is reflected in these meanings and the illustrative materials that accompany them. Thus, as an example of this tendentiousness, one finds the following Soviet "proverb" taken from a 1955 *Soviet* collection of *Ukrainian* proverbs (!) to illustrate the use of the word *halyčany* ("Galicians"): "Červona Armija Zbruč perestupyla—*halyčanam* sonce zasvitylo" (The Red Army crossed the river Zbruč, and the sun began to shine for the *Galicians*, 2:20)! This introduction and sudden growth of Soviet "proverbs" is paralleled by a distortion of Ukrainian traditions. Thus, in the dictionary *Did Moroz* (2:299), or "Grandfather Frost," has replaced the Christian *Svjatyj Mykolaj* ("St. Nicholas") and comes to visit children not on 6 December (Old Style) or 19 December (New Style), but on New Year's Eve! And as if this were not enough, in this intrusion of Soviet culture into Ukrainian Christian traditions, a *Rizdvjanyj did* (8:563) has become equated with this *Did Moroz*, although a *did*, or "grandsire," on Christmas Eve is a sheaf of grain brought into the house and placed in the position of honour under the icons.³ Yet this anti-religious bias is somewhat of an enigma. On the one hand, it can range from the removal of the Christian connotation from a word like *lucyper/ljucyper* ("Lucifer") by equating it with the word *bis* ("devil," or "house demon") in its definition—which dilutes the power of the accompanying illustrative example taken from Shevchenko: "Na ditej svojix

² B. Strumins'kyj, "The New Academy Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 1, no. 2 (June 1977): 242-8.

³ *Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopaedia* 1 (Toronto, 1963): 321-2.

ne hljanuv Lucyper prokljatyj” (The accursed *devil* [instead of the correct *Lucifer*] would not even look at his children, 4:559)—to such deliberate anti-religious propaganda as labeling Christ a *mythical* figure under *Jevanhelije* (“Gospel,” 2:494) and Metropolitan Andrej Sheptyč’kyj “a fierce janissary in priest’s clothing” under *janyčar* (“janissary,” 11:643); or, if not worst of all, defining the command forms *Perexrestys’!* and *Perexrestit’sja!* as meaning “come to your senses” (*sxamenys’!*, *sxamenit’sja!*, 6:317) rather than “make the sign of the cross,” which they actually mean. On the other hand, this anti-religious propaganda can be absent altogether. Thus, for the word *rozp’jattja* (“crucifixion,” 8:787) one finds the neutral meaning: “xrest iz zobražennjam rozp’jatoho na n’omu Isusa Xrysta i same zobražennja rozp’jatoho” (a cross with a representation on it of the crucified Jesus Christ or the representation of the crucified [Christ] by itself). Apparently not every definition was written to please the Soviet censor!

Another paradox is the fact that the dictionary not only russifies the Ukrainian language but simultaneously also preserves non-russified dialectal and archaic Ukrainian words for future generations. Before citing examples of this paradox, we would like to note that as far as the compilers of the dictionary are concerned, the term “russification” is applicable only to the assimilationist policies of tsarist Russia, if one is to believe the meaning given by them for *rusyfikacija* (8:911), while the historical appellation for Ukrainians—i.e., *rus’kyj* (“Ruthenian”)—is defined by the compilers *first* as “colloquially equivalent to a *Russian*, or *Soviet*, person” and only *last* as “Ukrainian”; but that last definition is marked as *Western Ukrainian* in usage and *archaic* to boot (8:913)! Need one say more?

Among the obvious Russian borrowings in the dictionary—yet not marked as such—one finds such examples as *davka* (cf. Russian *davka*, “traffic jam,” 2:205), *zjomka* (cf. Russian *s’emka*, “film shooting,” 3:583), and, for the time being still only on the colloquial level, *t’otja* (cf. Russian *tëtja*, “aunt,” 10:350) and *familija* (cf. Russian *familija*, in the meaning of “surname,” 10:557). But the dictionary also contains Russian borrowings that are not as obvious. These are numerous loan translations, such as *zal čekannja* (cf. Russian *zal ožidanija*, “waiting room,” 11:290), the use of which in the Ukrainian language the Soviet Ukrainian linguist Borys Antonenko-Davydovyč protested against, because their Russian “roots” are not always immediately recognizable and they replace perfectly good Ukrainian words that have been in use for many generations. Thus, for example, despite the objection to the word *vidšče-penec’* (“renegade, apostate”)⁴—a loan translation of the Russian *otšče-*

⁴ B. Antonenko-Davydovyč, *Jak my hovorymo* (Kiev, 1970), pp. 44-45.

penec—this word has been included in the dictionary (1:666). In all fairness to the compilers, however, the traditional Ukrainian word with this meaning—*vidstupnyk*, the continued use of which was championed by Antonenko-Davydovyč—has also been included (1:645) without any marker of secondary status in the Ukrainian language. On the other hand, Antonenko-Davydovyč's fears that the word *livša* ("lefty," obvious adaptation of the Russian *levša*, 4:508) has almost totally displaced the traditional Ukrainian word *šul'ha*⁵ have been substantiated by the dictionary, in which *šul'ha* is marked as "archaic" (11:560), while *livša* bears no such marker!⁶

A positive aspect of this marking, however, is the fact that such words as *šul'ha* and other "archaic" words like it—e.g., *vakaciji* ("vacation," 1:282) *latyna* ("Latin," 4:434) and *licytacija* ("auction," 4:533)—despite their apparent secondary status in current official Soviet Ukrainian, have *not* been deleted from the Ukrainian lexicon. The same can be said of words marked "dialectal." Thus, one finds in the dictionary such "dialectal" words as *bezčel'nyj* ("shameless," 1:153), *zavaljaty* ("to soil," 3:37), *doperva* ("just," 2:370), and *obrus* ("tablecloth," 5:572), the illustrative examples for which are all drawn from such classics of Ukrainian literature as Lesja Ukrajinka, Ivan Franko, Myxajlo Kocjubyns'kyj, and Myxajlo Staryc'kyj! Consequently, all of these "archaic" and "dialectal" words still "live" in the language and, as a result of having been preserved in the dictionary, have the potential of reentering the literary language in the future.

In view of the paradoxes just described, this reviewer has mixed feelings about the publication of the academy dictionary. The irrefutable fact remains, however, that a ten-year project of great magnitude has been brought to a successful conclusion despite its one-sidedness, or rather perhaps because of it. In spite of its enumerated flaws by this and other reviewers, the academy dictionary will stand the test of time as a unique, major undertaking in Ukrainian lexicography.

George A. Perfecky
La Salle College
Philadelphia

⁵ Ibid., pp. 63-64.

⁶ As a postscript to this struggle for the preservation of traditional Ukrainian words, one might add that apparently it sometimes pays to complain, for the words *pomaranča* ("orange") and *čužynec'* ("foreigner"), which have definite secondary status in the Podvez'ko dictionaries (see *Sučasnist'*, 1976, no. 9, pp. 35, 40-41) appear in the academy dictionary as equivalents of *apel'syn* (7:113) and *inozemec'* (11:379) respectively.

SLOVNYK STAROUKRAJINS'KOJI MOVY XIV-XV ST., 2 vols. Editor in chief: L. L. Humec'ka. Kiev: Naukova dumka, 1977-78.*

The *Slovnyk staroukrajins'koji movy XIV-XV st.* (Dictionary of the Old Ukrainian Language of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries) is based on a catalogue of some 260,000 cards (completed in 1962) housing up to 12,000 words found in the Ukrainian charters of that historical period. The editor, Lukija Humec'ka, and her co-workers, should be congratulated for completing a painstaking task in which she could not rely on the unfinished historical dictionary of her predecessor, Jevhen Tymčenko, who based his lexicon mainly on the texts of the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries (hence beyond the scope of the present work).¹ Moreover, Tymčenko had improperly designated many texts as Ukrainian merely because of their territorial provenance, paying no attention to their linguistic features.

Because in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries Ukrainians and Belorussians shared a chancery language (*aktova mova*), which became the official language of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, Humec'ka and her co-workers had to devise a set of linguistic principles in order to separate Ukrainian and Belorussian texts before collecting the lexical items and all of their variants for this dictionary. Consequently it is descriptive rather than prescriptive in orientation. A given text was judged to be Ukrainian if, for example, it exhibited such linguistic features as the confusion of the etymologically correct *e* with *i* and of *y* with *i*, or changes in *o* and *e* in new closed syllables. Belorussian texts were judged Belorussian by such features as consistent *akanje* and hence were excluded from this dictionary. Unlike Tymčenko, Humec'ka and her co-workers used territorial provenance as a criterion for deciding whether a text was Ukrainian or Belorussian only in the case of linguistically neutral texts. In addition to Ukrainian documents, this dictionary also includes and marks Moldavian texts that, besides exhibiting certain features of Middle Bulgarian orthography (for example, the confusion of the back with the front nasal vowel letter), were often characterized by such specifically southwestern Ukrainian dialectal features as the confusion of unstressed *o* with *u*, or the change of *a* into *e* after soft consonants, and for this reason were considered by Humec'ka to be Ukrainian.

* This review employs the international linguistic form of transliteration.

¹ Je. Tymčenko, *Istorychnyj slovnyk ukrajins'koho jazyka*, vol. 1, bk. 1: A-V (Kharkiv-Kiev: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo Ukrajin, 1930); vol. 1, bk. 2: H-Zh (Kharkiv-Kiev: Ukrajin'ska radjans'ka entsyklopedija, 1932).

To Humec'ka's credit, this dictionary, unlike the recently completed eleven-volume *Slovník ukrajinských slov* also published by the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR, carries meanings that are almost *totally* neutral and factual—at least as far as this reviewer was able to discern. Thus, for example, one finds for the meaning of the word *rusin* (2:308) the statement that this was the “designation for a Ukrainian of feudal times (*nazva ukrajintsja feodal'noji doby*),”² while the meanings of religious terms, e.g., *khristijanin* (“Christian,” 2:518) and *Khristos* (“Christ,” 2:519) are neutral in tone and exhibit no anti-religious bias. The only biases appear to be: (a) in the preface (pp. 5-7), written by editor in chief of the above-mentioned eleven-volume academy dictionary of modern ukrainian, Academician I. K. Bilodid; (b) the slight “snub” at Romania (p. 14); and (c) the disputed “overuse of the letter *je* which wrongly suggests a soft pronunciation of consonants before *e*,” as in Russian or Belorussian, which was noted by Bohdan Strumins'kyj.³

One should mention also the politically forced misnomer in the title of the work, which more properly represents the chancery lexicon of Early Middle Ukrainian than of “Old Ukrainian” of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. What direct bearing do Lenin's *Complete Collection of Works*, the Communist Party's *Theses Concerning the Three-Hundredth Anniversary of the Reunification of Ukraine with Russia*, or Brezhnev's *On the Fiftieth Anniversary of the USSR* have on the lexicography of fourteenth- and fifteenth-century Ukrainian to be quoted in four of the six footnotes in Bilodid's three-page preface? Quite obviously his purpose was purely political. Moreover, was it necessary to use a double standard in classifying southern and northern Bukovynian geographic names in this dictionary? Thus, although both northern and southern Bukovyna were part of the Moldavian principality in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, southern Bukovynian place names now within the borders of Romania are classified as if still located “in the Moldavian principality,” while northern-Bukovynian names now within the Ukrainian SSR are marked as located “in Bukovyna” (p. 14).

Apparently the most important of the three biases mentioned above was the one noted by Strumins'kyj, for it provoked an attack on him by Humec'ka in the Kiev journal *Movoznavstvo* as a rebuttal to his review.⁴

² One might add that this was also the designation for a medieval Belorussian, but not a Russian. However, for the sources Humec'ka and her co-workers were using in compiling this dictionary, this definition is absolutely correct.

³ *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 2, no. 1 (March 1978): 130-1. This was a review of the first volume only.

⁴ L. Humec'ka, “Z pryvodu zamitky Bohdana Strumins'koho pro *Slovník staroukrajinských slov XIV-XV st.*, K.: Nauk. dumka, 1977. T. 1,” *Movoznavstvo*, 1980, no. 5, pp. 91-92.

According to Humec'ka, "in all written monuments of the XIV-XV centuries only *je* was used," and hence Strumins'kyj was wrong in positing the existence of two *je*'s for this period.⁵ Her position is certainly debatable, for the principles for transliterating the texts found in the manual she herself followed mention two *je*'s: one which was narrow and vertical with an upwardly raised tongue, and one which was broad and leaning and, one might add, to the left; the rules recommend that in publications both be transliterated by a modern Ukrainian *je*, for both, according to the rules, tend to mark an iotized *e*.⁶ Strumins'kyj disagrees with this recommendation, for he feels that the function of an iotized *e* was carried in these texts by a broad *je* only.⁷ Humec'ka, on the other hand, is absolutely correct in stating that it is hardly possible to pinpoint a "single date" for the completion of the dispalatalization of consonants before *e* for all of the different dialectal areas.⁸ Yet, Soviet authors of Ukrainian historical grammars attempt to do just that by delimiting a longer period of time, but usually for one set of given dialects. For example, M. Zhovtobrykh states that the dispalatalization of consonants occurred in southwestern Ukrainian dialects between the end of the twelfth and the middle of the thirteenth centuries.⁹ This is chronologically earlier than the time period covered by the *Slovnnyk staroukrajins'koji movy* and would tend to favour the presence of two functionally different *je*'s—one broad and leaning, the other narrow and vertical (described yet erroneously treated by the above-mentioned rules—at least for the charters of these southwestern dialects).

⁵ Ibid., p. 91.

⁶ M. Peščak and V. Rusanivs'kyj, *Pravyla vydannja pam'jatok ukrajin's'koji movy XIV-XVIII st.* (Kiev, 1961), p. 37.

⁷ For a more detailed discussion of the problem, see Strumins'kyj's review of *Ukrajins'ki hramoty XV st.* (ed. V. Rusanivs'kyj) and *Hramoty XIV st.* (ed. M. Peshchak) in *Recenzija* 6, no. 1 (Fall-Winter 1975), pp. 2-4; for forged charters of 1322, 1388, and 1389, not very convincingly disputed by Humec'ka in her rebuttal, which were also used as sources in the dictionary under review, see pp. 12-13 of the same review.

⁸ Humec'ka, p. 91.

⁹ M. Zhovtobrykh et al., *Istorychna hramatyka ukrajins'koji movy* (Kiev, 1980), p. 92. In a slightly older historical grammar one finds the statement that in all probability "the process of the hardening (i.e., dispalatalization) of consonants before *e* in the Ukrainian language occurs mainly in the thirteenth century." This, in effect, is a generalization for all, if not most, of the Ukrainian dialectal areas and hence could be questioned because of its all-inclusiveness. See O. P. Bezpal'ko et al., *Istorychna hramatyka ukrajins'koji movy* (Kiev, 1962), p. 170. Of course, hushing consonants are excluded from this discussion, since they hardened much later.

Despite its disputable points, the *Slovnyk staroukrajins'koji movy*, in addition to its neutral meanings, is useful also for other reasons. It not only marks foreign borrowings in Ukrainian, but also points out the source from which they came, and in the case of indirect borrowings also the intermediary language or languages through which a given foreign word entered Ukrainian (e.g., *arcibiskup* via Old Czech and Old Polish *arcybiskup*, from the original Latin *archiepiscopus*, 1:80). Moreover, it marks the frequency in the use of each lexical item and its variants. However, in the case of words with several meanings the most frequently used meaning can appear last—if its use is only regional—as in the case of *věra* as “an attestation to the truth of something,” found in this meaning only in Moldavian documents (1:229, meaning 5). In addition to geographical names, the *Slovnyk* also lists personal names and even corrects them in brackets if misspelled, and provides cross-references to where their use is illustrated (e.g., *Boajewycz* < *Brajewycz* >, see *Brajevič*, 1:102). In view of such detailed hard work, one can only hope that this is only the beginning, and that Humec'ka and her co-workers will be able to expand this dictionary to the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, as well as to include the language of literary documents that had been originally excluded from this lexicon.

George A. Perfecky
La Salle College
Philadelphia

БОРИС АНТОНЕНКО-ДАВИДОВИЧ, **ЯК МИ ГОВОРИМО**. II-е вид. Торонто — Балтімор: Українське в-во "Смолоскип" ім. В. Симоненка, 1979. хіі, 271 стор.

Мовні питання здавна цікавили як учених-мовознавців, так і любителів мови взагалі.

Останнім часом в Україні і поза її межами з'явилося чимало робіт, присвячених різним аспектам розвитку української мови, серед яких особлива увага приділяється не тільки питанням ортографії (тобто правопису) і ортоепії (правильної вимови), а й питанням про правильне висловлювання думки, правильне будування фрази.

Серед багатьох цінних праць, присвячених питанням культури мови,¹

¹ Крім періодичного журналу "Питання мовної культури", що виходить у Києві з 1967 р. у видавництві "Наукова думка" (з 1971 р. назва журналу була змінена на "Рідне слово"), на тему мовної культури варто згадати ще такі праці, як "Як правильно будувати фразу?" П. Ковалева (Нью-Йорк, 1973, II-е вид., 16 стор.), "Складні питання українського слововживання" Є. Д. Чак (Київ, 1969, 219 стор.), і "Українська фразеологія. Чому ми так говоримо" Ф. П. Медведєва, (Харків, 1982, II-е вид., 231 стор.).

заслугує особливої уваги книжка видатного українського письменника, літературознавця, мовознавця та громадського діяча Бориса Антоненка-Давидовича "Як ми говоримо" (Київ, 1970). Ця книжка заходами об'єднання українських письменників "Слово" була перевидана українським видавництвом "Смолоскип" і є зараз доступною на еміграції для всіх тих, хто цікавиться українською мовою і "хто хоче", — як згадано у вступному слові загального редактора книжки кандидата філологічних наук Івана Варченка, — "вдосконалити свою мову, хто дбає про культуру мови й прагне уникнути помилкових слів-покручів та невластивих українській мовній традиції зворотів і висловів" (стор. IV).

Книжка складається зі вступу, кількох розділів, мовний матеріал в яких згрупований в основному за частинами мови, додатків видавництва "Смолоскип" (куди ввійшли уже згадані вище дві статті автора книжки), бібліографічного списку книжок, статей та словників, зв'язаних з темою **Що читати про культуру української мови, та післяслова.**

Книжку перевидано без жодних змін і додано до неї статтю автора "Літера, за якою тужать" (про літеру г) та автобіографічний нарис письменника "Про самого себе". Книжка відкривається вступною статтею "Дух, що тіло рве до бою" Надії Світличної, яка знала письменника особисто. Книжка Антоненка-Давидовича є значним вкладом у розвиток і вдосконалення української мови. Її не можна зрівняти ні з яким підручником, в якому теоретично розроблені різні питання фонетики, лексики, граматики чи навіть стилістики. Ця книжка є підсумком набуття і поєднання теоретичних знань з практичним використанням мови.

Дуже часто в українській мові плутають не тільки при усному вживанні, а то, подекуди, і на письмі близькі за змістом або звучанням слова. Тому нерідко можна почути замість **заступник** — **замісник**, замість **особа** — **особистість**, замість **цікавість**, **цікавий** — **інтерес**, **інтересний**. Часто плутають і вживають не на своєму місці слова **книжка** і **книга**, **переписка** й **листування**, **талан** і **талант** та інші.

Добре знання наукової творчості, класичної та сучасної української літератури і північних і південних українських говорів, а також багаторічне спостереження над розмовною мовою та її використанням у різних галузях повсякденного життя — у наукових та громадсько-культурних установах, у школі, театрі, радіо та телевізійних передачах і т. п. — дало змогу авторові написати цінну книжку. В ній автор радить, в якій мовній обстановці краще вжити те слово чи інше, те словосполучення чи інше, той мовний зворот чи інший, ту граматичну форму чи іншу. Одним словом — це книжка, в якій Антоненко-Давидович дає пораду, в якій мовній ситуації краще буде вжити слово **вірний** чи **правильний**, **дійсний** чи **справжній**, **другий** чи **інший**, **захист** чи **оборона**, **книга** чи **книжка**, **вираз** чи **вислів**, **будівля** чи **будова**, **недолік** чи **хиба**, **вид** чи **вигляд**, **пам'ятник** чи **пам'ятка**, **зараз** чи **тепер**, **одночасно** чи **одночасово**, **приймати участь** чи **брати участь** і т. п.

У кожному із розділів автор наводить зразки як з художньої літератури і публіцистики, так і з різних виступів, радіо-телевізійних передач, неправильного вживання слів та словосполучень, у багатьох випадках неправильно перекладених чи скалькованих з російської мови, не тільки письменниками початківцями, а навіть і досвідченими працівниками на культурно-громадському фронті. Однак автор книжки не називає ні прізвища тих, що помилилися, ні тих, що пропустили ці помилки в друкові. "Я робив це", — пише автор, — "свідомо: яка потреба викликати в читача недовіру до, часто доброї, мови письменника, журналіста або науковця, які випадково допустились тої чи іншої помилки? Ніякої. Помиляємось ми більшою чи меншою мірою всі" (стор. 258). Тут же, після хибних речень, Антоненко-Давидович наводить і позитивні приклади з тих же самих джерел — з класичної та сучасної літератури, з народної творчості, живого народного мовлення, з різних словників, збірників та статей, щоб підтвердити свою думку або пропозицію, як правильно вживати окремі слова, словосполучення чи цілі фрази. Таким чином, читач книжки для кожного випадку має перед собою два типи прикладів: хибні речення з неправильним вживанням слів і словосполучень та позитивні приклади з правильним вживанням окремих слів чи словосполучень з конкретним вказанням на їхнє джерело.

Автор наводить дуже багато прикладів, які ілюструють окремі питання синтакси простого речення — як вживання прямого і непрямого додатків, дієслівне керування, вживання називного й орудного відмінків іменників та прикметників у функції іменного складеного присудка та ін. Для зразку порушених вище питань наведу кілька прикладів.

"Як буде правильно сказати: писати (читати) листа чи лист, пришити гудзик чи гудзика?"

Антоненко-Давидович відповідає на це дуже просто: "Такі питання часто виникають перед тими, хто не гаразд відчуває дух української мови" (стор. 28). Я б сказав, що навіть і ті, хто добре володіють українською мовою, відчувають її дух і всі її тонкощі, натрапляють на труднощі в цьому і подібному питаннях.

В іншому місці книжки читаємо таке:

"Як краще казати по-українському: "Мій батько був коваль" чи "Мій батько був ковалем", "Вона була гарна дівчина" чи "Вона була гарною дівчиною"? (стор. 27).

На перший погляд здавалось би, що це паралельні форми і що між ними немає ніякої різниці. Однак вживання називного чи орудного відмінка іменника чи прикметника в іменному складеному присудку визначається їх ознакою — постійною чи тимчасовою. Іменник і прикметник у називному відмінку однини виражають постійність, сталість, а в орудному — тимчасовість, змінність. Тому такі сталі ознаки, як національність, територія, по-

ходження, довгорічна професія та под. можуть бути виражені тільки називним відмінком. Отже, у таких реченнях, як "Шевченко був українець", "Мій батько за походженням закарпатець", "Довгі роки він був учитель" виражається стала ознака, тому всі частини складеного присудка виражені називним відмінком. В останньому реченні іменник у складеному присудку "був учитель" може вживатися і в орудному відмінку. У такому випадку він уже буде виражати не постійну ознаку, а тимчасову, змінну: "Довгі роки він був учителем". Це значить, що він був учителем у минулому, а потім з якихось причин змінив свою професію і став працювати на іншій роботі.

Одним із позитивних явищ книжки є також те, що автор указав на цілий ряд хибних кальок, тобто на буквально копіювання окремих слів та виразів з російської мови. Знаючи добре і російську мову, деякі письменники та працівники на громадсько-культурному фронті при формулюванні своїх думок вдаються до прямого перекладу окремих слів, словосполучень і речень з російської мови на українську, не задумуючись над тим, що українська мова має відповідні слова та словосполучення, які краще передають зміст і дух української мови. Такого роду зауваження дуже цінні не тільки при оригінальному писанню, а навіть і при перекладах з однієї мови на іншу. Правда, що можна завжди точно перекласти якесь слово чи вираз з однієї мови на іншу, але в контексті часто таке слово чи вираз буде звучати штучно, не на своєму місці. Тому треба вдаватись за такими словами чи виразами до скарбниці живої народної мови, а не до перекладу. Для ілюстрації наведемо кілька прикладів з книжки:

Відповідно до російських слів *отношение, относительно* часто надуживають словами **відношення, відносно**, забуваючи про інші, точніші, природніші слова: "Не можна допускати поверхового **відношення** до такої серйозної справи", — замість — поверхового **ставлення**...; "**Відносно** цього не може бути двох думок" — замість — **про це (щодо цього, з приводу цього)**; "Я з ним у добрих **відношеннях**", — замість — у добрих **стосунках, взаєминах, зв'язках** (стор. 42).

Часто російський вислів "потерять сознание" перекладають на українську мову словосполученням "**втратити свідомість**": "Хлопчик уже **втратив свідомість**" замість "...хлопчик **знепритомнів** чи **зомлів** або **вмлів**" (стор. 85), або "Через годину потерпілий повернувся до **свідомості**" (стор. 85). "Це груба калька, — пише Антоненко-Давидович, — створена без усякої на то потреби" (стор. 85). Замість "повернувся до свідомості" краще вжити дієслово **опритомніти** або вислів **прийти до пам'яті**, які широко вживані у класичній українській літературі.

Крім позитивних сторін книжки, які, само собою розуміється, аж ніяк не можна вичерпати у короткому огляді, є, звичайно, і ряд недоліків чи промахів автора. На них слушно вказав у своєму вступному слові редак-

тор книжки Іван Варченко. Ми повністю поділяємо його цінні зауваження, які, мабуть, Антоненко-Давидович врахував для евентуального наступного перевидання книжки. Автор книжки, на нашу думку, надуживає слово **гаразд** і надає йому, крім стверджувальної функції, ширшого значення, обмежуючи, таким чином, функцію інших прислівників та прислівникових конструкцій, як **добре, досить добре, не досить добре** та подібних. Для зразку наведемо кілька прикладів з книжки, в яких, у багатьох випадках, краще було б вжити замість конструкції зі словом "гаразд" іншу, більш підхожу конструкцію з іншими стверджувальними чи заперечними прислівниками чи прислівниковими виразами.

Ці два слова (тобто **нагода й пригода**) — немов камінь спотикання для тих, що **не гаразд** знають українську мову й тому часто ставлять їх не там, де треба" (стор. 66). "Це можна зрозуміти **гаразд**, тільки прочитавши попередні або дальші фрази" (стор. 82). "**Не гаразд** буде по-українському сказати **прийняти пропозицію**; треба: **схвалити пропозицію...** (стор. 174). "**Не гаразд** наприкінці частини оповідання чи статті, якщо їх мають друкувати в кількох номерах періодичного видання, писати: **продовження буде**, — слід, як завжди писалось: **далі буде**" (стор. 175). "Таке калькування російських висловів інколи навіть **не дозволяє гаразд** зрозуміти фразу..." (стор. 229).

Можна б навести ще багато прикладів зі словом "гаразд", які, у багатьох випадках, легко можна б замінити іншими словами, бо у деяких реченнях його вживання, нам здається, звучить неприродно, "ріже, як кажуть, на вухо".

Не зважаючи на такі незначні недогляди автора, книжка, безперечно, має велике значення, оскільки в ній Антоненко-Давидович порушує питання живої розмовної мови і правильного використання її внутрішніх багатств і можливостей. Тому ми радімо всім, хто цікавиться українською мовою, прочитати цю цінну книжку і позбавитися, таким способом, слів та нетипових конструкцій, які суперечать духу української мови.

Микола Павлюк
Торонтський університет

WILLIAM DARCOVICH AND PAUL YUZYK, EDS. *A STATISTICAL COMPENDIUM ON THE UKRAINIANS IN CANADA 1891-1976*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1980. xxxiii, 834 pp.

The *Statistical Compendium* is hardly the book for lazy reading at the summer cottage or making the time pass more quickly on a transatlantic flight. It is, however, a remarkably extensive tome, which embraces a mass of statistics on Ukrainians in Canada covering the years 1891-1976.

Using census data, as well as other published and unpublished government material, and with the financial support of many Ukrainian-Canadian foundations in addition to the Canada Council, the team of authors and its support staff compiled this digest.¹ It shall serve as an immense resource of information for anyone interested in the various aspects of Ukrainian-Canadian life. In the editors' words, the compendium is:

a comprehensive statistical volume whose aim is to present, in one place and in a systematic way, available and relevant statistics on Ukrainians in Canada . . . with the ready access to basic data provided by the compendium, the researcher's time devoted to data search and assembling—the 'donkey work' in analysis—should be reduced, leaving more time . . . to formulate, articulate and test hypotheses and to draw conclusions on some of the important issues which face Ukrainians in Canada. (pp. 1-2)

Each chosen statistic has its own section in the compendium, and each of the six authors was responsible for one or more sections. The volume is made up of eighteen sections and three appendices covering the demographic, religious, economic, political, cultural, social, occupational and educational characteristics of the Ukrainian population in Canada, as well as immigration, disease, crime, and the ethnic press. Within each section, a summary describing and evaluating the particular data set is provided, followed by the tables themselves. A very useful feature is that most tables have provided data on other ethnic groups and on the total Canadian population, so that trends in the Ukrainian population can be readily analyzed in relation to the Canadian population as a whole and inter-ethnic comparisons can be made.

Upon first glance, the compendium, in terms of its myriad data tables, may be overwhelming. In spite of the fact that everyday life is becoming technologically more sophisticated, numbers, and particularly numbers within tables, can be very intimidating. For the most part, however, the tables are very simple constructions that can be read and interpreted facily. As well, though this is debated by statisticians, the tables lend themselves to higher statistical manipulations.

The authors point out that "[n]ot all available data on each subject were used in this work. This was the result of screening to ensure that only the most meaningful statistics were included" (p. 2). While the endogamy rate for Ukrainians in the Atlantic Provinces was not incorporated into table on endogamy owing to "the small number of marriages contracted and to the high year-to-year variability which they exhibit" (p. 642), there is a statistic showing the number of Ukrainians, by

¹ The team of authors included Paul Yuzyk, William Darcovich, Ivan Tesla, Boris Myhal, Zenon Yankowsky and John Woychyshyn.

province and sex, who died in the summer of 1957 and the number of blind Ukrainians in Canada in 1941. That not all available data have been utilized here is understandable. What is questionable, however, is the screening device. By what criteria is the rate of blindness "more meaningful" than endogamy rates in the Atlantic Provinces, as small and variable as they may be? While not negating, by any means, the usefulness of the included statistics, in this reviewer's opinion, choosing the "most meaningful statistics" is a most subjective process of screening and should be explained in more detail by the authors.

Certain summaries are confusing and incomplete in their explanations, and their tables irksome to interpret. This is particularly true of the Basic Marriage Series Tables and Summaries included in the "Vital Statistics" section. This series, writes its author, "summarizes, by provinces, all available data from 1921-1971 on the number of Greek Orthodox, Greek Catholic and total brides and bridegrooms" (p. 641). Although the summaries supposedly provide explanatory information concerning the data tables and their interpretation, here they add to, rather than alleviate, the confusion. The summary for an especially perplexing table, "Brides by Religious Denomination of Bridegroom, Canada 1921-1971," states: "[The table] shows marriage within and outside the denomination or marriage that can be classified as endogamous and exogamous" (p. 642). That a marriage may be classified both "within and outside the denomination" and also as being both "endogamous and exogamous" is quite astonishing, not to mention infeasible, from the social scientist's point of view. The table, in itself, is more nebulous than its summary in terms of exactly what trend it is attempting to display.

In explaining the source of the exogamy rate for all marriages of all denominations in Canada in 1971, the summary reads: "[It] is obtained by subtracting the endogamous rate from 100" (p. 642). It would be helpful, if not essential, information for a researcher in this area to be given the mathematical derivation of the number 100. No explanation is given.

The summary for "Estimates of Endogamous Marriage Rates for Ukrainians" describes how the endogamy rates for the Greek Orthodox and Greek Catholic churches were combined to calculate the rate for all Ukrainians, as both were showing a decreasing rate prior to 1951. Apparently after 1951, claims the author, the endogamy rates for the Greek Orthodox Church rose, but they are not included in the table, because "values for 1961 and 1971 [are] not considered appropriate." The author writes:

Their rate is believed to have declined, similarly to that for the Ukrainian Greek Catholics, a position... supported by the decline in the Greek Orthodox rates for the prairie provinces. Hence in

1961 and 1971 the Greek Catholic rate alone is used as a proxy for the rate of endogamy for all Ukrainians. (p. 643)

First, sources for this information should have been provided, but are not. Secondly, further explication is necessary. That Greek Orthodox endogamy declined in the prairie provinces is hardly ample representation of a downward trend of Greek Orthodox intermarriage in Canada overall. As well, to suggest that "[the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox] rate is believed to have declined" while the actual statistics show the rate increasing is contradictory and insufficient as a reason warranting their omission from the table. To use the Greek Catholic rate alone "as a proxy for the rate of endogamy of all Ukrainians" is illogical and, more important, may be a misrepresentation of actual endogamy rates, because the Greek Orthodox rate (whether it is rising, declining, or remaining constant) is not included.

These may appear to be petty criticisms; nevertheless, such shortcomings are scattered throughout the compendium and may lead to distorted statistical representations. The researcher should realize this when utilizing these data.

Those who argue that numbers and statistics have no place in the social sciences may choose not to utilize the compendium; at least, however, the option to take advantage of it now exists. Even a cursory glance at the existing literature reveals that very little has been written on Ukrainians in Canada. The compendium is a step in the right direction despite its imperfections.

Although it may serve as a foundation for developing both qualitative and quantitative research, the compendium's access should not be limited to academics alone. It is, in itself, an excellent fountainhead of information on Ukrainian Canadians. Though the editors' statement that the compendium "will make a positive contribution to Canadian nationhood" (p. v) may be over-zealous, they have made a contribution to Ukrainian scholarship by meeting the need for a basic reference source.

Nadia Skop
University of Toronto

ALEKSANDER SOKOLYSZYN AND VLADIMIR WERTSMAN, EDS., *UKRAINIANS IN CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES: A GUIDE TO INFORMATION SOURCES*. Detroit: Gale Research Co., 1981. xiv, 236 pp.

Volume Seven in the Ethnic Studies Information Guide Series of the Gale Research Company, this book has two major components. Parts A

to E constitute a bibliography of approximately one thousand annotated entries (the majority in the English language) organized under four broad headings: general reference works on Ukrainian topics; Ukrainian immigration, settlement and contributions in Canada and the United States; Ukrainian culture and heritage preservation and development in Canada and the United States; and Ukrainian organized group life, education, social interaction and politics in Canada and the United States. Part F is a directory of Ukrainian organizations, churches, selected periodicals (past and current), publishing houses, and book stores in the two countries. The bias of the compilers, in both the bibliography and directory, is toward nationalist, right-wing, and Ukrainian Catholic sources.

While the compilers did not intend their bibliography to be comprehensive, one wishes that their selection criteria, both overall and within each category, had been better explained. Outside of being published in North America, many titles, such as the literary works of Franko and Shevchenko and the dissident writings of Chornovil, Grigorenko, Moroz, Osadchy and others, are irrelevant to the history of the Ukrainians in the United States or Canada. The annotations themselves are characterized by repetitive formulaic phrases and are rarely informative. Too many simply parrot the title of the work: an article, "Ukrainian Farmers in the United States" (D-125), for example, examines "the role of Ukrainian farmers in American agriculture"; and a thesis, "The Organizational Life of Ukrainian Canadians; with Special Reference to the Ukrainian Canadian Committee" (D-10), examines the "history of Ukrainian-Canadian organized life, and the importance of the Ukrainian Canadian Committee." Such comments are superfluous.

More disturbing is the suspicion that the compilers were frequently unfamiliar with a work, for some annotations are misleading, and others erroneous. Nestor Dmytriw's account of his 1897 visit to Canada and tour of the fledgling Ukrainian settlements in the West (B-69) is labelled "the interesting memoirs of a Ukrainian-Canadian pioneer." John Lehr's *Ukrainian Vernacular Architecture in Alberta* (C-353), which deals exclusively with the construction of pioneer houses, is said to look at "original Ukrainian architecture, especially wooden churches." Watson Kirkconnell's note on Ukrainian-Canadian literature and the Ivan Bobersky library in Winnipeg (B-46) is characterized as a "brief description of Ukrainian-Canadian life, including religious and cultural aspects." Alexander Royick's article, "Ukrainian Settlements in Alberta" (B-97), described as a "history of Ukrainian immigrants and their settlement in the province of Alberta, pioneer life, organizations, economic, religious, and political involvement," essentially identifies areas of Ukrainian settlement according to dialect and districts of origin in Ukraine. I am most familiar with Canadian-content materials, but if the same inaccuracy prevails throughout the bibliography, its reliability as a guide is seriously jeopardized.

The directory, while undoubtedly useful, tends to neglect organizations of the left, and, in comparison with their detailed listings for the United States, virtually ignores the churches in Canada. In addition, obvious mistakes in identifying institutions make one wary. The Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies at the University of Alberta, for example, is mentioned twice in the directory (p. 162, p. 197), both times with incorrect—but different—addresses. While the difficulties in ensuring up-to-date information in a current directory are appreciated, one at least should be able to expect consistency in its errors.

There are three indices—author, title, subject—to the volume. The subject index contains some rather surprising headings (such as “captive nations,” “Ukrainian cause”), while others give the impression that major headings were not thought out carefully to avoid unnecessary overlap or repetition and that entries were not always exhaustive. “Ukrainian immigration” overlaps with “immigrants, Ukrainian,” for example; “homesteaders, Ukrainian” and “Ukrainians in the free world” have just one entry each; and “Ukrainian identity” has only three entries when the subsection in the text on ethnic identity and social mobility boasts no less than eighteen. The entries under some subject headings simply do not make sense, and one would suspect that poor editing was at fault. Why *A Sketch of Wasyl Zahara: The First Ukrainian Settler in Gardentown* [sic] and *The First Ukrainian Immigrant from Bukovina to Canada* (B-78) is one of three entries under “assimilation” is as much a mystery as the omission of “The Ukrainian Teacher as Agent of Cultural Assimilation” (D-78).

While it is admitted that editing a work of this nature is laborious and difficult, the frequency of typographical and other errors and inconsistencies is inexcusable. If Sokolyszyn and Wertsman were to be believed (p. 191), this review would be appearing in the *Journal of Graduate Studies*, a publication of the Canadian Institute of Graduate Studies. Such carelessness, coupled with problems in the bibliography arising from lack of personal acquaintance with some of the material, has resulted in shortcomings that tend to obscure the merits of the guide.

Frances Swyripa
University of Alberta

BOHDAN P. PROCKO, *UKRAINIAN CATHOLICS IN AMERICA: A HISTORY*. Washington: University Press of America, 1982. xiv, 170 pp.

This brief history is prefaced by acknowledgements, a note on transliteration, a list of abbreviations, and an introduction. It contains six chapters: I. Immigration, Organization and Conflicts; II. Administration of the

First Bishop; III. The Interregnum; IV. Early Administration of Bishop Bohachevsky; V. The Road to Maturity; VI. The Contemporary Period. The book ends with three statistical appendixes and footnotes that contain the relevant bibliographical sources.

Historians will find Procko's work an excellent reference resource for the history of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in the United States. The chief strength of the study is the journalistic exactness with which it presents historical data, a reflection of the fact that it evolved out of the author's dissertation. This is particularly true of the first five chapters. Chapter six is a later addition. As such, it manifests certain weaknesses. Foremost among them is a lack of critical examination of sources used. For example, in chapter six, section four, the author, along with the sources used (*Ukrainian Vatican Synod 1980: A Documentary* [Stamford, Ct., 1980], edited by Dr. Victor J. Pospishil), claims that the Ukrainian Catholic Church achieved self-government, or *pomisnist*, as the result of papal decisions taken in the Ukrainian Vatican Synod 1980. This does not square with the papal document entitled *On February 17* referred to by the author. Towards the end of this document Pope John Paul II states quite unequivocally how the Major Archbishop (not Patriarch) of the Ukrainian Catholic Church shall thenceforth (1980) administer it:

The Major Archbishop, 'at the will of the Supreme Pontiff,' will be able to convoke other synods, either to handle business or to propose candidates for the episcopate. He will proceed as follows: (1) for each individual synod, a *request to be able to hold it* will be submitted to the Pope, together with a *disclosure* of the questions to be considered; (2) having obtained *authorization*, the Major Archbishop will call a synod of all Ukrainian bishops; (3) the declaration of March 25, 1970 regarding 'aggregatus' will be applied to such synods.

The papal document states quite clearly that the Major Archbishop *cannot* convene a synod without the explicit permission of the Pope, and then only after the Pope has scrutinized the agenda and allowed its convocation. How anybody in the Ukrainian Catholic Church can deduce or infer self-government from this papal document is difficult to understand.

Owing to the absence of comprehensive bibliographies that would deal with the history of Ukrainians in the United States, a bibliographical summation at the end of the book would have greatly enhanced its usefulness as a resource tool.

Russel P. Moroziuk
Concordia University,
Montreal

BOOKS RECEIVED

- ARMSTRONG, John A. *Nations before Nationalism*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982. xxxvi, 411 pp.
- BIALER, Seweryn and Thane GUSTAFSON, eds. *Russia at the Crossroads: The 26th Congress of the CPSU*. London, Boston and Sydney: George Allen & Unwin, 1982. viii, 223 pp.
- GRABOWICZ, George G. *The Poet as Mythmaker: A Study of Symbolic Meaning in Taras Sevcenko*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1982. x, 170 pp. Dist. by Harvard University Press.
- HUMENNA, Dokiia. *Nebesnyi zmiï: Fantastychna povist na tli praistorii*. New York: Research Society for Ukrainian Terminology, 1982. 262 pp.
- LANE, David. *The End of Social Inequality? Class, Status and Power under State Socialism*. London, Boston and Sydney: George Allen & Unwin, 1982. x, 176 pp.
- MARKOVITS, Andrei S. and Frank E. SYSYN, eds. *Nationbuilding and the Politics of Nationalism: Essays on Austrian Galicia*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1982. viii, 343 pp. Dist. by Harvard University Press.
- MELNYCHUK, Taras. *Iz-za grat: Poezii*. Baltimore and Toronto: V. Symonenko Smoloskyp Publishers, 1982. 83 pp.
- MISHKO, Stepan. *Narys rannoi istorii Rusy-Ukrainy*. Ed. with an intro. and summary by Alexander Dombrowsky. New York, Toronto and Munich: Ukrainian Historical Association, 1981. 226 pp.
- ROYCE, Anya Peterson. *Ethnic Identity: Strategies of Diversity*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1982. viii, 247 pp.
- RUDENKO, Mykola. *Orlova balka: Roman*. New York and Toronto: V. Symonenko Smoloskyp Publishers, 1982. 454 pp.
- RYWKIN, Michael. *Moscow's Muslim Challenge: Soviet Central Asia*. Armonk, N.Y. and London: M. E. Sharpe Inc., 1982. x, 186 pp.
- TYKHYY, Oleksii I. *Rozdumy: Zbirnyk stattei, dokumentiv, spohadiv*. Comp. by O. Zinkevych. Baltimore and Toronto: V. Symonenko Smoloskyp Publishers, 1982. 79 pp.

ERRATUM

In our spring 1982 issue, the last 4 lines in para. 2 on p. 39 should read: "This is less of a problem for the contemporary Russian or Ukrainian. He seems to have lost some of his feeling for the Orthodox religion and has pretty much accepted the Petrovia concept embodied in the new name of his state, the Soviet Union."

CANADIAN INSTITUTE OF UKRAINIAN STUDIES PUBLICATIONS

Social Sciences

1. Peter J. Potichnyj, ed., *Poland and Ukraine: Past and Present*, 1980. 365 pp.
Cloth \$14.95 Paper \$9.95
2. Jurij Borys, *The Sovietization of Ukraine, 1917-1923: The Communist Doctrine and Practice of National Self-Determination*, 1980. 488 pp.
Cloth \$19.95 Paper \$12.95
3. *Volodymyr Vynnychenko: Shchodennyk (Diary)*. Edited, annotated and with an introduction by Hryhory Kostyuk, 1980. 500 pp. *In Ukrainian*.
Cloth only \$30.00
4. Ivan L. Rudnytsky, ed., *Rethinking Ukrainian History*, 1981. 269 pp.
Cloth \$14.95 Paper \$9.95
5. John Basarab, *Pereiaslav 1654: A Historiographical Study*, 1982. xxvii, 322 pp. Cloth \$19.95

Please order from the *University of Toronto Press, 5201 Dufferin Street, Downsview, Ontario, Canada, M3H 5T8*. Cheques should be payable to University of Toronto Press.

Ukrainian Literature

1. Mykola Zerov, *Lektsii z istorii ukrainskoi literatury (Lectures on the History of Ukrainian Literature)*, 1977. 271 pp. *In Ukrainian*.
Cloth \$9.95 Paper \$3.95
2. *Vaplitianskyi zbirnyk (The VAPLITE Collection)*. Edited and with an introduction by George S. N. Luckyj, 1977. 260 pp. *In Ukrainian*.
Cloth \$10.95 Paper \$4.95
3. *Antolohiia ukrainskoi liryky, chastyna 1 — do 1919 r. (An Anthology of Ukrainian Lyric Poetry, Part 1 — To 1919)*. Edited and with an introduction by Orest Zilynsky, 1978. 439 pp. *In Ukrainian*.
Cloth \$13.95 Paper \$6.95

Journal

4. *Ukrainian Dumy: Editio Minor*. Translated by George Tarnawsky and Patricia Kilina; introduction by N. K. Moyle, 1979. 219 pp. Published jointly with the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute.
Cloth \$9.95 Paper \$5.95
5. *Shevchenko and the Critics, 1861-1980*. Edited by George S. N. Luckyj; introduction by Bohdan Rubchak, 1980. 520 pp. Published for the CIUS by the University of Toronto Press.
Cloth \$30.00 Paper \$8.50

Please order the above books from the *University of Toronto Press*.

6. Mykhailo Kotsiubynsky, *Shadows of Forgotten Ancestors*. Translated by Marco Carynnyk; with notes and an essay by Bohdan Rubchak, 1981. 127 pp. Published for the CIUS by Ukrainian Academic Press.
Cloth U.S.\$14.50 Paper U.S.\$9.50

Please order from *Ukrainian Academic Press, P.O. Box 263, Littleton, CO 80160, USA*.

Ukrainian Language

1. Assya Humesky, *Modern Ukrainian*, 1980. 438 pp. Paper only \$8.00.
2. *Ukrainian-English Dictionary*. Compiled by C. H. Andrusyshen and J. N. Krett. Published for the University of Saskatchewan by the University of Toronto Press; reprinted with the assistance of the CIUS, 1981. xxix, 1,163 pp.
Paper only \$19.95
3. Danylo Husar Struk, *Ukrainian for Undergraduates*, xxxii, 350 pp. Revised reprint of the 1978 edition. Paper only \$10.95

Please order the above books from the *University of Toronto Press*.

4. George Y. Shevelov, *A Historical Phonology of the Ukrainian Language*, 1979. vi, 309 pp. Published for the CIUS by Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
Cloth 500 Dm Paper 460 Dm

Please order the above book from *Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, Postfach 10 61 40, 6900 Heidelberg 1, West Germany*.

Ukrainian-Canadian Studies

1. Frances Swyripa, *Ukrainian Canadians: A Survey of Their Portrayal in English-Language Works*, 1978. 169 pp. Published for the CIUS by the University of Alberta Press.

Cloth \$9.95

Paper \$3.95

2. Manoly R. Lupul, ed., *Ukrainian Canadians, Multiculturalism and Separatism: An Assessment*, 1978. 177 pp. Published for the CIUS by the University of Alberta Press.

Paper only \$4.95

Please order the above two books from the *University of Alberta Press*, 450 Athabasca Hall, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada, T6G 2E8.

3. W. Roman Petryshyn, ed., *Changing Realities: Social Trends among Ukrainian Canadians*, 1980. 249 pp.

Paper only \$7.95

4. William A. Czumer, *Recollections about the Life of the First Ukrainian Settlers in Canada*. Translated by Louis L. Laychuk; introduction by Manoly R. Lupul, 1980. xvi, 176 pp.

Cloth \$9.95

Paper \$5.95

5. Wsevolod W. Isajiw, ed., *Ukrainians in the Canadian City*. A special issue of the journal *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, 1980. ix, 138 pp. Published for the CIUS.

Paper only \$3.00

6. Jars Balan, ed. *Identifications: Ethnicity and the Writer in Canada*, 1982. xii, 158 pp.

Paper only \$7.95

Please order the above four books from the *University of Toronto Press*.

A CIUS publications catalogue is available upon request from the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 352 Athabasca Hall, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alta., T6G 2E8.

TO THOSE WISHING TO SUBMIT MANUSCRIPTS

All submissions must be typed on 8½ x 11 inch paper and double-spaced throughout. Footnotes should be placed at the end of the manuscript. Block quotations and four or more lines of verse from Ukrainian should appear in the original. Otherwise the modified Library of Congress system of cyrillic transliteration should be used.

In general, articles should not exceed 25 double-spaced pages, except where especially justified by extensive documentation, tables, or charts. For purposes of style and footnoting, the University of Chicago Press *Manual of Style* should be consulted. Authors should send a short academic biography with their submissions. Manuscripts will not be returned unless specifically requested and postage provided. The policy of the *Journal* is not to consider articles that have been published or are being considered for publication elsewhere. The editors reserve the right to edit all submissions.

A TABLE OF TRANSLITERATION (Modified Library of Congress)

а — a	ї — i	ф — f
б — b	й — i	х — kh
в — v	к — k	ц — ts
г — h	л — l	ч — ch
ґ — g	м — m	ш — sh
д — d	н — n	щ — shch
е — e	о — o	ю — iu
є — ie	п — p	я — ia
ж — zh	р — r	ь — -
з — z	с — s	-ий — y in endings
и — y	т — t	of personal
і — i	у — u	names only

